25:2

Property of
Graduate Theological Union
APR 7 1987

ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

the springfielder

SUMMER, 1961

THE SPRINGFIELDER

Vol. XXV Summer, 1961 No. 2

THE SPRINGFIELDER is published quarterly by the faculty of Concordia Theological Seminary, Springfield, Illinois, of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE
ERICH H. HEINTZEN, *Editor*
J. A. O. PREUS, *Associate Editor*
MARK J. STEEGE, *Associate Editor*

Contents

Page

EDITORIALS
The Right to Say It 1
State of the Church Conference 1
Pietism and Legalism 3

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT 4
Arnold Deke, Kansas City, Kansas

CARL FERDINAND WILHELM WALTHER—CHURCHMAN 23
Carl S. Mundinger, Winfield, Kansas

FREUD, MOWRER, AND THE PROBLEM OF ANXIETY 34
Henry J. Eggold, Jr., Professor, Homiletics

MORE POWER FOR LUTHERAN PULPITS 46
Rudolph F. Norden, Chicago, Illinois

CALLED TEACHERS' RETIREMENT: A FACULTY OPINION 55

BOOK REVIEWS 57

Books Received 71

Clergy changes of address reported to Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., will also cover mailing change of *The Springfielder*. Other changes of address should be sent to the Business Manager of *The Springfielder*, Concordia Theological Seminary, Springfield, Illinois.

Address communications to the Editor, Erich H. Heintzen, Concordia Theological Seminary, Springfield, Illinois.

Business correspondence should be addressed to Norman A. Bumby, Business Manager, Concordia Theological Seminary, Springfield, Illinois.

Editorials

The Right to Say It

THIS issue, we are pleased to note, contains a number of articles and statements which are in their very nature controversial. This brings to mind, incidentally, that we have been asked once or twice whether this or that opinion expressed represented "the position of the faculty." The answer is: sometimes, yes; sometimes, no. The position of the faculty, however, is that a writer has liberty (within the bounds of Scripture and the canons of good taste) to speak his mind on such issues, as stated in a previous number of THE SPRINGFIELDER (December, 1959):

> While the variety of contributors will always endeavor to speak with one voice "the things which become sound doctrine," the accents will understandably vary; especially in those areas where the Scriptures do not speak or where they present difficulties, and in the realm of the *adiaphora* which runs the gamut of everything from upholstered pews to synodical policies. Here there are and must be allowable differences of opinion. There must also be freedom to discuss these differences among brethren.
>
> *E. H. H.*

* * *

The State of the Church Conference

"*ALL in all the State of the Church Conference must be regarded as a miraculous gift of divine grace by our ascended Lord to His church in these last evil days in which Missouri's historic fate hangs in the balance.*"

"*This was not an official conference of the Missouri Synod, but it was a meeting of a very small and extremist minority whose charges cannot be substantiated by objective investigation.*"

Neither of the statements quoted above characterizes the State of the Church Conference with complete accuracy. We are unwilling to believe that it was a "miraculous gift of divine grace" or a meeting of a "very small and extremist minority whose charges cannot be substantiated."

In evaluating the Conference generally, we would offer a few observations wholly in the realm of opinion:

1. The brethren had a right to call the Conference. In fact, they could be commended for their concern for the welfare of this human organization in which we hold membership, The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod.

2. The large attendance (600) is indicative of "unrest in Synod." Without a doubt those six hundred men represented a much larger group with similar concerns.

3. The meeting is evidence of a lack of decisive leadership in Synod. Officialdom, Convention Floor Committee Three, the faculties of the two seminaries, and official organs have failed to exercise the theological leadership during the past decade which their critically important positions afforded them.

4. To criticize the Conference because of the presence of Major Bundy is a magnificent example of the logical fallacy, *argumentum ad hominem*. His presence as consultant (which role is currently denied and affirmed) is wholly unrelated to the essence and purpose of the meeting.

5. To refer to Valparaiso University as "our secular school" is at best a snide remark and at worst represents an un-Lutheran and un-Scriptural distinction between the sacred and the secular.

6. The continued attacks upon revisions of the King James Version constitute a type of obscurantism which we can ill afford "in these last evil days."

7. The State of the Church Conference attempted too much. The Doctrine of Scripture, Bible versions, the Faculties' Statement on Fellowship, the eccumenical movement, the National Council of Churches, the World Council of Churches, the National Lutheran Council, the Lutheran World Federation, the Walther League, Valparaiso University, the Synodical colleges and seminaries, Masonry, and the Brief Statement cannot be intelligently discussed within a two-day period.

8. We cannot escape the conclusion that much of the difficulty in Synod today is cultural and not doctrinal in origin. We are not minimizing the seriousness of the problem when we observe that the State of the Church Conference is symptomatic of the difficulties arising from our Synod's passing from a cultural and social isolation into America's mainstream. In spite of two World Wars and

the breakdown of the language barrier, the transition has not been completed. As a result, phenomena of the nature of the State of the Church Conference will be with us for a long time.

9. Finally, friends of ours, in sympathy with the purposes and objectives of the Conference, expressed deep disappointment over the resolutions adopted. After all the preliminary fanfare which the Conference received, they expected something more decisive and positive than the resolutions which resulted from the deliberations.

G. J. B.

* * *

Legalism and Pietism

LEGALISM and pietism have been a menace to evangelical Christianity in every age of the church's history. Not infrequently devices and methods (gimmicks, if you please) are used to influence Christian behavior. Ignoring the fundamental Scriptural and Lutheran distinction between Law and Gospel, well-meaning users of these devices frequently justify their employment, especially in the areas of church attendance and the stewardship of money, on the grounds that "they work."

It was heartening, therefore, to read the following in H. C. Nitz's column, "By The Way," in the *Northwestern Lutheran,* organ of the Wisconsin Synod:

> "This raises a point that is frequently debated by pastors and teachers: Should the teacher in a Christian school admonish his pupils to attend church services? Should he keep a record of his pupils' church attendance? Should church attendance be recorded on the report card? Should pupils be in some way penalized for poor church attendance? Should they in some way be rewarded for regular attendance at church services?
>
> It makes a teacher's heart ache to learn that some of his charges "despise preaching and His Word." He will, perhaps at the close of school on Friday, remind his pupils of the meaning of the Third Commandment, but the *responsibility* for church attendance, as indicated by the writer quoted above, rests with the parents. *Theirs* is the obligation to bring their children up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. To train a child to go to church is an obligation that parents cannot sublet to the teacher."

G. J. B.

Capital Punishment

Arnold G. Deke

An essay originally presented to the North Central Pastoral Conference of the Northern Nebraska District, October, 1960. The author is now pastor of Our Savior Lutheran Church, Kansas City, Kansas.

ACCORDING to the Fifth Commandment of the Decalog, the taking or destroying of human life is strictly forbidden, whether this be by premeditated murder, suicide, euthanasia, or sheer recklessness and carelessness. Life is God's precious gift to man. As we are to guard this gift through rules of health, hygiene, and medical science, so God guards it by His providential care and by the rules laid down in the Fifth Commandment. Our earthly life is precious, and once gone, it cannot be replaced. Capital punishment, the penalty of death pronounced by a competent and authoritative tribunal, is one of the ways in which God would have life protected. "Thou shalt not kill," is a warning to man to keep hands off and if he doesn't, then the proper authorities of the state have the right to take his life.

The main purpose of capital punishment is to protect life. This method of protecting life finds its origin in the rigid system of theocratic laws in the Old Testament and still exists by divine sanction in the New Testament where God placed this power into the hands of constituted authority.

There is no denying that we have become hardened to murder. We read and hear of it so often that we have become calloused to its real seriousness. There are enough murders committed each year to depopulate a city of several thousand. If a tornado, earthquake, or a flood would destroy so many people, the nation would be shocked; but murder that many people in a given year and the populace pays little attention! Many citizens, deeply concerned about this, feel that we ought to use the death penalty more frequently in order to check this trend toward more murders. Others feel that capital punishment is not the answer. Other methods of punishment and intensified programs of prevention and rehabilitation need to be devised. It is the scope of this paper to examine the arguments pro and con and to see whether we can arrive at some tenable conclusions.

I. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT AND PRESENT STATUS

Hebrew laws, theocratic in nature, contained very rigid regulations as far as the death penalty was concerned. We do note, however, that in their laws we find introduced the idea of degrees in crime and degrees in punishment, for not every case of destroying life was punishable with death. Circumstances determined the degree or severity of the punishment. We would emphasize the fact that the Hebrew laws were absolute and permitted no legal loopholes and masterful maneuverings so frequently found in the courts of a democratic society.

It is interesting to note that there were a number of crimes and sins, in addition to murder, punishable with death. We list these with Bible references.[1,2]

The sin of adultery. "And the man that committeth adultery with another man's wife, even he that committeth adultery with his neighbor's wife, the adulterer and the adulteress shall surely be put to death." Lev. 20:10.

The sin of bestiality. "Whosoever lieth with a beast shall surely be put to death." Ex. 22:19.

The sin of blasphemy. "And he that blasphemeth the name of the Lord, he shall surely be put to death, and all the congregation shall certainly stone him: as well as the stranger, as he that is born in the land, when he blasphemeth the name of the Lord, shall be put to death." Lev. 24:16.

The sin of cursing one's parents. "And he that curseth his father, or his mother, shall surely be put to death." Ex. 21:17.

The sin of idolatry. "If thy brother, the son of thy mother, or thy son, or thy daughter, or the wife of thy bosom, or thy friend, which is as thine own soul, entice thee secretly, saying, Let us go and serve other gods, which thou has not known, thou, nor thy fathers; Namely of the gods of the people which are round about you, nigh unto thee, or far off from thee, from the one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth; Thou shall not consent unto him, nor hearken unto him; neither shall thine eye pity him, neither shalt thou spare, neither shalt thou conceal him; But thou shalt surely kill him; thine hand shall be first upon him to put him to death, and afterwards the hand of all the people. And thou

shalt stone him with stones, that he die; because he hath sought to thrust thee away from the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage." Deut. 13:6-10.

The sin of incest. "And if a man shall take his sister, his father's daughter, or his mother's daughter, and see her nakedness, and she see his nakedness; it is a wicked thing; and they shall be cut off in the sight of their people; he hath uncovered his sister's nakedness; he shall bear his iniquity." Lev. 20:17.

The sin of rape. "If a man find a betrothed damsel in the field, and the man force her, and lie with her: then the man only that lay with her shall die." Deut. 27:25.

The sin of breaking the Sabbath laws. "And while the children of Israel were in the wilderness, they found a man that gathered sticks upon the sabbath day. And they that found him gathering sticks brought him unto Moses and Aaron, and unto all the congregation. And they put him in ward, because it was not declared what should be done to him. And the Lord said unto Moses, The man shall be surely put to death: all the congregation shall stone him with stones without the camp." Num. 15:32-35.

The sin of unchastity. "Then they shall bring out the damsel to the door of her father's house, and the men of her city shall stone her with stones that she die; because she hath wrought folly in Israel, to play the whore in her father's house; so shalt thou put evil away from among you." Deut. 22:21.

The sin of witchcraft. "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." Ex. 22:18.

It seems that these rigid requirements of the law set the tone also for other nations for years to come. The laws of Hammurabi were extremely severe in meting out punishments. The death penalty was used as a punishment for many crimes. Soon, however, men began to see the injustices and inequalities, and more care was exercised in the use of the death penalty. In the thirteenth century, death was, by the common law of England, the punishment for all felonies (except mayhem and petty larceny), but under the influence of the church this extreme severity of the law was lessened. From the beginning of the 17th century to the middle of the 19th century, the condemned felons were given the option of deportation

for the purpose of colonization. At the beginning of the 19th century, due to certain writers and molders of public opinion, the two hundred capital crimes were reduced to four, namely; high treason, murder, piracy with violence, and destruction of dockyards. Since the middle of the 19th century the death penalty under English law has been exacted only for murder. It seems that treason, from attacking the divinity of kingship to the modern crime of attacking the security of the state, has always been punishable by death.[3,4,5]

In the study of the historical development of the laws covering capital crimes, it is also interesting to note the different forms of punishment that have been used. We list the following methods as among the severest and most gruesome; burning at the stake, boiling in oil, buried alive in an iron casket, breaking the body on the wheel, flaying, throwing the criminal to ferocious animals, stoning, drowning, crucifixion, and decapitation.[6,7]

From old world history we turn briefly to our country. The early colonists listed twelve offenses as being capital in nature. This number was gradually reduced. In 1892, a federal law was passed which reduced the number of crimes to three, namely; treason, murder, and rape. Since that time the matter of punishing capital crimes exclusive of treason has been left pretty well to the constituent states.[8]

The number of prisoners executed in the United States under civil authority from 1921 to 1950 shows a steady decrease. The average annual number of executions in this thirty-year period was 135. In 1950, it totaled 82, the lowest number in the three decades. The November, 1953, issue of the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences,* says: "The trends in the use of the death penalty are solidly established in history. A study of them during the past 250 years can be summarized briefly: the overall international trend is toward the progressive abolition of capital punishment." This trend in our country is demonstrated by the decreasing number of executions. In 1958, there were only 48 executions and in 1959, there were 49. J. Edgar Hoover makes this comment: "The average sentence served by persons after conviction for murder is only 43½ months and the prison doors in our country swing open every 2½ hours day after day to release a murderer."[9]

Today there are 35 countries throughout the world where capital punishment has been completely abandoned, and sentiment against the death penalty is rapidly gaining ground in our country.[10]

II. ARGUMENTS PRO

Already prior to the famous Chessman case of California, there have been many voices against capital punishment. But we hasten to add that the voices in favor of capital punishment have not been silenced. It is our intention in this portion of the paper to present the main arguments for and against the death penalty. We begin with the arguments favoring the retention of this form of punishing the murderer.

The basic argument in favor of capital punishment is that it serves as a deterrent to crime. This, as we shall show later, also seemed to be God's objective in introducing capital punishment. If it is argued that the death penalty does not serve as a crime deterrent, then the fault lies not in capital punishment itself, but in the infrequency with which it is administered, with legal loopholes and technicalities, subterfuges, delays, legal maneuverings, and often, a deliberate attempt to arouse public opinion in favor of saving the condemned criminal's life. It is claimed by some that this is one of the basic reasons for the occasional existence of lynching mobs. Enraged citizens fear that the law will be too lenient with the criminal, consequently they take the law into their own hands. There have been countries and states where the death penalty was once abolished, but then restored when it became apparent that crime was beginning to take a Roman holiday. Rumania, after 74 years, restored the death sentence; Austria, in 1938, restored it after 22 years of abolition; Italy, in the year 1939; and South Dakota restored it in 1939, giving the jury the right to grant mercy.[11]

Eight states during 1959 and 1960 refused to abolish capital punishment. The most noteworthy case was that of California, which refused the governor's request to pass a law to abolish the death penalty. This received public attention because of the Chessman case.[12]

Justice must be upheld and the basic American law that the accused is assumed innocent until proven guilty, must be honored

and respected, but the present-day trend to coddle the criminal, it is argued, is certainly no crime deterrent. Let me quote a few pertinent examples from Courtney Ryley Cooper's book, *Here's to Crime:* "The Bremer kidnaping could not have been accomplished without the aid of two members of the Police Department." "Verne Miller, the multiple murderer was ushered from city to city bearing letters of introduction which, in one case, put him on a golf course with city officials."[13] "Affiliated crimesters regard the electric chair as having been built for suckers. Fellows with brains and influence may be put into the death house, where they can watch the casuals of crime travel to the last waltz, but it is only a visit until 'somebody can get to the governor'."[14]

It is argued by the abolitionists that a life sentence can be more of a deterrent than capital punishment. There are, however, a number of cases on record where imprisonment did not stop a man's continued murdering. One of the states that restored capital punishment did so because a murderer killed his keeper. He had been sentenced for life; now in the new crime what other sentence was there to be imposed except the death penalty? There might be a point to a life sentence being a crime deterrent if we had more *life* sentences. As pointed out above, the average "life term" runs only about 43½ months. At the age of 23 a man knows that with good behavior he can soon get out and still have a long life ahead of him. A life term, terminating after 43½ months, simply does not scare many hardened criminals. Advocates of abolition say that life imprisonment is worse than death. This apparently does not hold true so far as the thinking of the criminal is concerned, for no criminal has ever been known to reject a commutation of a death sentence to life imprisonment. If a condemned criminal can or must make a choice, he will take a life sentence in preference to the death penalty.

III. ARGUMENTS CON

Death penalty opponents make a strong case in their arguments. Herbert Wechsler, Professor of Law at Columbia University, lists five basic reasons why people oppose capital punishment.[15]

1. *The argument against deterrence.* Sociologist Thorsten Sellin compared the number of homicides per 100,000 population

in areas where the death penalty is used with those in areas where it has been abolished. His studies reveal that the frequency of homicide does not seem to be influenced by the retention of the death penalty. Another writer reaches the same conclusion and states:

"Our growing psychological understanding of the motivation of murderers makes it clear that the death penalty has no deterrent effect on potential murderers."[16] Men like Warden Lewis E. Lawes of Sing Sing, Clarence Darrow, renowned criminal lawyer, and leaders in the American League to Abolish Capital Punishment have argued that the death penalty does not stop crime and that the condemned usually are too poor to afford good legal counsel. They point to the fact that the educated and well-to-do generally are able to escape capital punishment.

Hearst publications at the time of the murders committed by Ruth Judd editorialized thus: "Does the State set a Christian example by committing murder for murder when Christ taught His followers to abandon the ancient, brutal, and brutalizing policy of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth? Does the State set a civilized example in committing murder for murder? The State murders in cold blood, and it murders with deliberation, premeditation, and intent to kill,—and it murders as cruelly and brutally as any murderer can,—and finally it insists upon killing with savage methods rather than allowing a woman to put herself out of the way. In all history horrible punishments have not prevented crime. They have merely brutalized the community or given evidence of an already brutalized community."

David Dressler in an article on capital punishment appearing in the January, 1960, issue of *Coronet* says: "The death penalty would be morally acceptable to some if it could be shown that executing one individual deters others from committing like offenses. In the 18th century in England, pickpockets were hanged before great gatherings as a warning. The practice was abandoned because too many pickpockets picked the pockets of people watching the hangings." He also refers to an incident in 1877 when ten men were hanged on one day in Pennsylvania for murderous conspiracy. At that time the New York Herald editorialized: "We may be certain that the pitiless severity of the law will deter the most wicked from anything like the imitation of these crimes." Mr. Dressler

says: "The conclusion was wrong. The next day two prosecution witnesses were murdered. Within two weeks, five of the prosecutors met the same fate."[17] And thus the abolitionists go on, seeking to produce strong evidence against the argument of deterrence. We may sum up their arguments somewhat along these lines. "It is the certainty and not the severity of punishment that deters criminals. When a murder is committed the murderer is usually in a state of intense anger, jealousy, and excitement; at the moment he isn't thinking of the consequences in terms of capital punishment."

2. *Effect on the Administration of Justice.* The second argument used by the opponents of capital punishment is this that it has a negative effect on the administration of justice. It is argued that a trial in which life is at stake becomes inevitably a morbid and sensational affair, fraught with emotionalism for or against the defendant. This often affects the outcome of the trial, leading to errors in procedure which in turn lead to appeal after appeal. The emphasis of the argument here is that too many innocent people have been executed. Edwin M. Borchard, Professor of Law in Yale University, reviewing 65 cases of criminal prosecutions and convictions of completely innocent people came to the conclusion that these cases fall into clearly defined categories. His studies reveal that the following factors were largely responsible for condemning and convicting the innocent in the miscarriage of justice: mistaken identity, actually no crime committed, convictions based solely on circumstantial evidence, perjury, frame-ups, overzealousness of police, gross negligence of the police, overzealousness of the prosecution, prejudice because of prior convictions, the bad reputation of the accused, and community sentiment demanding a conviction.[18] As more cases of such a nature come to the attention of the public eye, the more intense becomes the feeling against capital punishment.

Sir Fitzroy Kelly called attention to 22 cases of capital convictions between 1802 and 1840 in which innocence was afterwards fully established. Seven of these 22 actually suffered death. It is estimated that 5 percent of those put to death are in reality innocent of the crimes of which they were accused.[19]

It is also argued that the death penalty makes for a far more expensive administration of justice, since it involves unending

chains of appeals on behalf even of the most obviously guilty who hope to be released on a technicality. It makes for greater inequality in the administration of justice, since anyone with enough friends and money can "beat the rap" one way or another.[20] Though we may not agree with all of the arguments of the abolitionists, we must admit that they are sincere and honest in their plans and motives. It is not the desire on the part of the abolitionists to lower the standards of justice, to excuse crime, or to gloss over the seriousness of murder. Rather, it seems to be their desire to find a more efficient way of dealing with the criminal.

3. *The argument of inequality.* Though this is already implied in the above section dealing with the administration of justice, the third main argument emphasized quite extensively by the opponents of capital punishment is this that not all cases are treated alike. Since judges and juries must make the decisions, no two cases, though identical in nature and equally guilty, will be handled in exactly the same way. As a case in point we refer to the South where it is usually the Negro who is executed for rape. In some states it is claimed that since the abolition of capital punishment, more convictions for life terms have been gotten because of the feelings of jury members against the death penalty. Thus the accused are more apt to be treated alike, is the argument.

4. *The argument of irreparability.* With capital punishment as the penalty, a mistake by which an innocent man is convicted cannot be corrected. The unfortunate but innocent man has been executed and he can not be restored to life by any process of law; while one with a life term, if and when found innocent, can be released and rehabilitated. His loss of time and personal humiliation can be partially offset by certain compensatory measures on the part of the court.

5. *The argument of salvaging and rehabilitating the prisoner.* Abolitionists feel that we ought to be more concerned about salvaging prisoners and reconditioning them for a useful life in society than killing them off in the electric chair. All sorts of statistics can be found, however, to prove either side of the case. California statistics show that of 342 prisoners convicted of first degree murder and paroled between 1945 and 1954, only nine had been returned to prison on a new felony conviction by June 30, 1956.

IV. STATEMENTS BY LUTHERAN THEOLOGIANS

Luther, commenting on the Fifth Commandment, says: "Here now we go forth from our house among our neighbors to learn how we should live with one another, every one himself toward his neighbor. Therefore, God and government are not included in this commandment, nor is the power to kill, which they have, taken away. For God has delegated His authority to punish evil-doers to the government instead of parents, who aforetime were required to bring their own children to judgment and sentence them to death. Therefore, what is here forbidden is forbidden to the individual in his relation to anyone else, and not to the government."[21] W. H. T. Dau says: "not to inflict capital punishment is a flagrant disregard of the divine Law. The dignity of human life is shown by the words: 'In the image of God made He man.' Man differs from fish, fowl, and beasts which are killed for food." Theodore Graebner: "Capital punishment has back of it both the natural law and the principles of government which we find in the New Testament." P. E. Kretzmann: "The punishment of murder is laid into the hands of the government, which shall punish the murderer by requiring his life in exchange for that which he took. This is the first command regarding the authority of the government in the wielding of the sword."[22] Paul M. Bretscher: "Yet over against all such reasoning stands the clear and unequivocal will of God that crime should be punished by the powers that be. A state which refuses to exercise this right to perform this duty which God Himself has imposed on it defies the will of our just and righteous God. But this God will not be mocked, neither by the citizens nor by the authorities of the State. 'Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap'."[23]

Probably the most noteworthy attempt to have an entire church body speak on the subject of capital punishment was made at the 1960 convention of the United Lutheran Church. The ULC Board of Social Missions recommended "that the Church declare itself for the abolition of capital punishment, and urge governments to seek more equitable and effective forms of punishment."[24]

The Board reported: "We believe that the state remains free under God to decide whether it will practice capital punishment or relinquish the exercise of this right." Among the Board's arguments in support of the recommendation, the following two points seem

to receive the greatest emphasis: 1. "It (capital punishment) tends to fall disproportionately upon those least able to defend themselves." 2. It makes a miscarriage of justice irrevocable."[25]

The recommendation was not adopted by the convention. There were 238 votes for it and 248 against it.[26]

V. PERTINENT TEXTS IN SCRIPTURE

Our discussion cannot possibly be complete unless we also look at the texts in Scripture that deal with this important matter. The first murderer was Cain. What about His punishment and the motive for the same? There were, no doubt, a number of reasons why God placed the mark on Cain. It was to be his punishment for the crime committed. It was to draw him to repentance. But in addition to this, it was also to serve as a warning to others and through this warning God wanted to keep similar crimes in check. As time went on, however, we note that violence increased. When the sons of God married with the daughters of men, God decided to check this wickedness by sending the deluge after 120 years of grace. It was immediately after the flood when God introduced capital punishment as a check against repetition. In Genesis 9:6 we read: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed, for in the image of God made he man." In the case of Cain, He personally dealt with the situation. In the post-deluvian age He arranged for constituted authority to administer capital punishment. This is the first commandment of God to the government in the matter of wielding the sword. If a man should become guilty of shedding his fellow man's blood, he should suffer death for that crime. It is quite apparent that this was not only to be a punishment, but also a deterrent.[27] In addition to the punishment and deterrence, God had another motive. He wanted for Himself a nation and a land that would be free of such wickedness. In Numbers 35:33 we read: "So ye shall not pollute the land wherein ye are; for blood it defileth the land: and the land cannot be cleansed of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it. Defile therefore not the land which ye shall inherit." When a murdered man was lying in a field and no one knew the identity of the murderer, then the elders of the city nearest the place where the body was found were to sacrifice a heifer in a rough valley and say these words: "Our hands have not shed this blood, neither

have our eyes seen it. Be merciful, O Lord, unto Thy people Israel, whom Thou hast redeemed, and lay not innocent blood unto the people of Israel's charge." That is how earnest God was in keeping Israel free from murder. God furthermore stresses the dignity He places on man. He was created in His image. This image, to be sure, was lost by sin, but restored in part by the redeeming powers of Christ. But here the unregenerate are also included, for in a wider sense, they bear the image of God in this that they are rational beings and have an immortal soul.

The whole crux of capital punishment seems to lie in the question whether or not it is part and parcel of the moral law of God. It does not belong to the moral law of God in the sense that the state is morally obligated to take the life of every murderer; however, neither did Jesus in the New Testament abolish capital punishment as belonging to the political and ceremonial laws of the Old Testament. It is more correct to say that capital punishment in the New Testament exists by divine permission and sanction and is to be used by the powers that be as they see fit. It is to be used by the state, not in the spirit of vengeance or harsh retaliation, but rather in the spirit of protecting its citizens.

Exodus 21:12-14 is another important reference to capital punishment. "He that smiteth a man, so that he die, shall be surely put to death. And if a man lie not in wait, but God deliver him into his hand; then I will appoint thee a place whither he shall flee. But if a man come presumptuously upon his neighbor, to slay him with guile; thou shalt take him from mine altar, that he may die." The first reference in this text is to a deliberate murder. Such a man, without question, was to be put to death. But, "if a man lie not in wait," if the killing was not deliberate and intentional, then God would later designate cities of refuge to which the man could flee for safety. But if it was deliberate and premeditated and carried out in cold blood, then the murderer could not seek refuge. Fleeing to the sanctuary of the Lord and clinging to its altar would avail him nought. The murderer in such a case should simply be torn from the altar of the Lord and be put to death for the life he had taken. He was to be put to death as quickly as possible.

Leviticus 24:17 is simply a restatement on what had already been said. "And he that killeth any man shall surely be put to

death." A few verses later, however, we have this addition, namely that the laws covering capital punishment should also apply to the strangers who happened to be in the land. "Ye shall have one manner of law, as well for the stranger, as for one of your own country; for I am the Lord, Thy God."

Another reference is Numbers 35:30-32. "Whoso killeth any person, the murderer shall be put to death by the mouth of witnesses; but one witness shall not testify against any person to cause him to die. Moreover ye shall take no satisfaction for the life of a murderer, which is guilty of death; but he shall be surely put to death. And ye shall take no satisfaction for him that is fled to the city of his refuge, that he should come again to dwell in the land, until the death of the priest." In addition to a restatement of the law of capital punishment, this text offers some specific instructions. The additions in this text take care of the injustices that can easily occur in carrying out the death sentence. One of the main objections raised by the abolitionists is that men are often condemned and even executed in spite of insufficient testimony. The principle of two or more witnesses is established here. The testimony of one person, no matter how reliable and trustworthy he might otherwise be, should not be deemed sufficient to put a man to death. This principle is clearly re-emphasized in Deuteronomy 17:6. "At the mouth of two witnesses, or three witnesses, shall he that is worthy of death be put to death; but at the mouth of one witness he shall not be put to death." Furthermore, the Israelites were instructed not "to take satisfaction for the life of a murderer." He could not save his life through the payment of a ransom or secure his freedom through bribery. Perjury, insufficient evidence, and bribery have condemned innocent men and have set guilty men free.

We turn to the New Testament. The first text under consideration is Matthew 26:52. "Put up again thy sword into his place; for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." This statement by Jesus in connection with the scene in Gethsemane created by Peter's impetuous act is used in support of capital punishment. It is argued that Jesus, through this statement, by implication, abolished capital punishment for blasphemy, idolatry, incest and the other sins mentioned in the Old Testament, but upheld capital punishment for murder as divinely required. The other side of the argument is: "Can we really uphold capital punishment for

murder when in the New Testament we no longer exact the death penalty for the other sins and crimes mentioned?" To say that Jesus in this text upheld capital punishment as an absolute requirement and that thereby He automatically eliminated the death penalty for other sins mentioned in the Old Testament is entirely without foundation and certainly does not fit into the context nor into the spirit of the occasion. It is, however, correct to say that in the second part of the statement, "all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword," Jesus is upholding the principle that God has given the state the permission and the authority to wield the sword at its own discretion in punishing crime, and particularly murder.

There are really two parts to the statement of Jesus. 1. Peter was not to interfere with God's plan of salvation. 2. Peter was to be aware of the authority of the state in wielding the sword rather than the individual citizen taking the law into his own hands.

We might paraphrase the text in the following manner: "Peter, put your sword away, for my purposes are not achieved nor my kingdom built by force and violence. And do you not realize that you can get yourself into serious trouble with the government if you take the law into your own hands; for if you should kill someone, the government has the divine right to take your life in exchange?"

What Jesus wants to emphasize in His statement as prompted by the occasion is that He wants no physical force to be used in promoting His cause. Under no circumstances are His followers ever to reach for the sword in matters of faith and salvation. If God wanted His Son to be rescued, He could do it by His own almighty powers or send legions of angels for that purpose, but there was to be no place for violence and force on the part of the disciples. In the church, the sword must never be used for the repression of what some think to be error nor for the propogation of what others believe to be the truth. "The followers of Christ shall not carry on their work with force of arms, but by the Word, in the power of the Holy Ghost." (P. E. Kretzmann, *Popular Commentary.)* Christ wants His Kingdom extended with the Sword of Truth and not with the sword of steel and violence. Adam Fahling in his *Life of Christ* says, "In offering resistance to those who were on

the point of arresting Jesus, he (Peter) was blocking salvation for himself."

The point of the first part of this statement then is that Jesus wants no interference in carrying out His redemptive work and that He does not want His Kingdom built by force.

The point of the second portion of the text might be summarized something like this: Peter had taken the sword which had not been given to him by authority. Christ admonishes him, but does not turn him over to the secular government for punishment. Here we have a warning against any unauthorized use of the sword and a sanction for constituted government to use it at its discretion.

What Jesus would have said or done if Malchus actually had been killed by Peter, we will have to consign to the realm of idle speculation.

The clearest and probably the most important text we have in the New Testament is Romans 13, especially verse 4. Here the origin, the authority, and the power of the government are clearly given. "For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." In every community where people live together there will also be wicked people who will disturb the peace, steal from others, and do harm to life and limb of their fellowmen. It is here that civil government must exercise its power according to God's will by punishing the evil doer, by imposing a fine, by sentencing to a prison term, by taking the life of a guilty murderer, "for he beareth not the sword in vain."

If the rulers according to God's own Word, are to be a terror to the evil and the evil are warned to be afraid,—"for he beareth not the sword in vain"—then it is clear that the real purpose of the death penalty is not only to punish, but also to restrain evil. As the moral law in general serves as a curb in checking the coarse outbursts of sin, so capital punishment is to repress violence and murder. God in His Word designates His agent who in His name and by His authority is to wield the sword in the punishment and restraint of evil. In the work of the Church Christians are the representatives of God in carrying on His Kingdom work; in the home the parents are the representatives of God in training the children in the fear and nurture of the Lord; and so in civil affairs

constituted government is the representative of God to praise and uphold the good and to be a terror to those who do evil—and this includes capital punishment. Government exists by divine right. It was ordained by God also for the purpose of protecting life and was endowed by God for backing up its authority with the power and the severity of the sword. I Peter 2:14 brings out the same thought: "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme: or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well."

Rev. 13:10 is another reference to the governmental sword. "He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity; he that killeth with the sword must be killed with sword. Here is the patience and the faith of the saints." The real emphasis here, however, is a comfort to the saints in the days of persecution. Christians must expect martyrdom. That is inevitable where the enemies of Christ have come into power. Pagan governmental powers, enemies of Christ, will use the sword against the true believers. Those who must suffer such persecutions are to be patient, for God in time and in His own way will punish those evil doers who interfere with His Kingdom work and plans. The state which abuses the privilege of the sword and misuses it in persecuting God's people will itself suffer at the hand of the Lord. "He that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword." God in time will punish the state which is guilty of such abuse.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of what has been presented, we now offer a number of conclusions.

1. Capital punishment is not murder, provided the accused person has been given a fair trial and his guilt incontrovertibly established.

2. Government has the authority and the duty to defend its country and to protect its citizens by waging war. By the same token it has the authority and the duty to protect its citizens by wielding the sword in capital punishment. If capital punishment is to be abolished on moral grounds, then by the same line of reasoning we must also abolish all wars.

3. Capital punishment today exists by the express permission and personal sanction of God.

4. It is clear that God instituted the death penalty as a restraint on crime and violence and if He in His omniscience and wisdom instituted it with that in view, then it will still have the same effects today if consistently carried out. If capital punishment does not deter crime, it is not the fault of capital punishment itself, but it is the fault of the courts which do not exercise their authority to the fullest measure.

5. Public sentiment is swinging toward the abolition of capital punishment. Nine states, namely: Maine, Rhode Island, Delaware, Michigan, North Dakota, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Alaska, and Hawaii have already abolished it. Convincing arguments and substantiating statistics can be found on both sides of the question and these will naturally be emphasized according to the beliefs and feelings of the person presenting them.[28,29]

6. The state may wield the sword in the manner and method it chooses. A Christian can with good conscience uphold capital punishment, but he need not sanction the cruel methods that have often been used. Nowhere does the Bible prescribe for our day the method to be used in capital punishment, whether by sword, firing squad, lethal gas chamber, the hangman's noose, the electric chair, or by a less gruesome method, as for instance death by injection.

7. A Christian may stand on either side of the question without denying Scripture, provided he does not claim that the state is committing murder when it carries out the death sentence. A Christian who is a member of a legislative body can vote to abolish capital punishment provided he does not violate his conscience.

8. The death penalty should be used only in cases where the guilt has been firmly established with incontrovertible proof. (Num. 35-30-32) (Deut. 17:6). To exact the death penalty on circumstantial evidence alone can easily take the lives of innocent people.

9. If capital punishment is to be continued, then society needs to strive for a greater uniformity in exacting the death penalty. The inequalities of justice are notorious in our country. Christian people can uphold capital punishment in theory, but the way it is carried out in practice is certainly an offense to the sensitive soul.

NOTES

1. *Encyclopedia Britanica* (1946), IV, 811.
2. Lamar Beman, *Capital Punishment* (Wilson Company, New York, 1925), 117ff., 357.
3. *Encyclopedia Britanica, loc. cit.,* 810.
4. Lamar Beman, *op. cit.,* 158ff.
5. Grant S. McClellan, *Capital Punishment* (H. W. Wilson Co., New York, 1961), 12.
6. *Encyclopedia Britanica, loc. cit.,* 811.
7. Lamar Beman, *op. cit.,* 163.
8. *Encyclopedia Britanica, loc. cit.,* 810.
9. David Dressler, "Capital Punishment is Murder." *Coronet,* January, 1960, 136.
10. Grant S. McClellan, *op. cit.,* 24ff.
11. *Encyclopedia Britanica, loc. cit.,* 810.
12. Grant S. McClellan, *op. cit.,* 10.
13. Courtney Ryley Cooper, "Here's to Crime," *Reader's Digest Book Supplement,* June, 1933, 112.
14. *Ibid.,* 122.
15. Herbert Wechsler, "Death Sentence: Its Pros, Cons," *Life,* May 9, 1960.
16. Lamar Beman, *op. cit.,* 4.
17. David Dressler, *loc. cit.*
18. Edwin M. Borchard, *Convicting the Innocent* (Garden City Publishing Company, N. Y., 1932), 379.
19. Lamar Beman, *op. cit.,* 354.
20. *Ibid.,* 3.
21. *Concordia Triglotta* (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1921), 631.
22. Paul E. Kretzmann, *Popular Commentary* (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1923) I, 21.
23. *Concordia Theological Monthly* (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis) Vol. 24, No. 3, 215.
24. *The Lutheran* (Philadelphia) Vol. 43, No. 2, 23.
25. United Lutheran Church *News Bureau,* October 17, 1960, 2.
26. *The Lutheran,* Vol. 43, No. 5, 8.
27. George O. Lillegard, *From Eden to Egypt* (Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, 1956), 82.
28. Grant S. McClellan, *op. cit.,* 10ff.
29. David Dressler, *loc. cit.,* 136.

Consulted but not cited in the notes:

Davis, John D., *A Dictionary of the Bible.* Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1929.

Fahling, Adam, *The Life of Christ.* St. Louis: Concordia, 1936.

Glueck, Sheldon, *Contributors to Correctional Science.* National Probation Association. New York; 1936.

Kinsolving, Lester, "Christianity and Capital Punishment." *Pastoral Psychology.* June, 1960.

Lane, Winthrop D., "What Makes Crime?" *Public Affairs Pamphlet.* New York, 1945.

Maurer, B. A., *The Ten Commandments Will Not Budge.* St. Louis: Concordia, 1951.

Thrasher, Frederic M., *The Problem of Crime Prevention.* National Probation Association. New York: 1934.

Yoder, John Howard, "Capital Punishment and the Bible." *Christianity Today.* February 1, 1960.

Carl Ferdinand Wilhelm Walther Churchman

Carl S. Mundinger

The third in a series of Walther Lectures delivered at the Seminary during the past schoolyear. Dr. Mundinger was formerly president of St. John's College, Winfield, Kansas, and is presently a professor there. He is author of Government in the Missouri Synod.

"IT WILL BE unnecessary to write a biography of Doctor Walther since we may assume that the details of his life are well known to our Christians." These words, written on October 3, 1911, by Dr. L. F. Fuerbringer, editor of *Der Lutheraner,* depict the degree of familiarization with the life of Doctor Walther in the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod of fifty years ago.

Are the facts of Dr. Walther's life sufficiently known to our people today? Can we assume that "our Christians," young and old, are knowledgeable of the great theologian? Is it within the realm of possibility that some of our students of theology, and even clergymen, are not as conversant with the life of the founder of our church as they might be?

Several years ago the *Walther League Messenger,* a magazine published by the organization of young people which derives its name from Dr. Walther, tried to determine the degree of familiarity of our people with the life of Walther. Their findings were most astonishing! Many of them seriously thought that Walther League was named after Walter A. Maier, the *Lutheran Hour* speaker. One of them even posed these questions: "Who and what does Walther represent?" "What church is he affiliated with?" *(Walther League Messenger,* Feb., 1959, p. 42). As recently as January of this year (1961) the editor of the *Walther League Messenger* wrote: "Take my word for it, as well as the word of the men on the staff here, that few Walther Leaguers know who Walther is." Can this be accepted as an apt description of our membership in general?

In order to understand fully what kind of a churchman Dr.

C. F. W. Walther was, we should have to discuss several episodes out of his life. However, the one we shall primarily consider is the Altenburg Debate.

What was the Altenburg Debate? What were the issues? Who were the factions? What was settled through the Theses adopted at Altenburg? The Altenburg Debate was not really a debate. It was more of a discussion of issues that had been simmering for some time and finally had come to the boiling point.

The Altenburg Debate took place on the 15th and 20th of April, 1841. The events which led up to the debate occurred two years or more before. Martin Stephan had been deposed on May 30, 1839. The man who led the Saxon immigrants in removing Stephan from their midst was none other than C. F. W. Walther. He left St. Louis on the 19th of May, arriving in Perry County in the dark of night. He carefully and stealthily saw that their land transactions were completed; that the right people were informed of the misdeeds of Stephan; preached on Sunday morning to a large gathering of the colony, and, after thus mending his fences, returned to St. Louis. He was in Perry County about eight or nine days.

Several days passed. Walther and the rest of the clergy discussed further the doings of Stephan. They informed the people who remained in St. Louis how they intended to deal with Stephan, and then made preparations for the remainder of the colony to go down to Perry County. Two boats, the *Prairie* and the *Toledo,* were hired to transfer the people from St. Louis to Perry County. The *Prairie* arrived at the mouth of the Brazeau on May 29, 1839. The *Toledo* discharged its passengers at the same place at five p.m. the same day.

On the morning of the 30th a council consisting of all the pastors and four of the leading laymen held a meeting. They first resolved to issue another summons to Pastor Stephan to appear before them. However, he refusesd to appear. The council countered by promptly excommunicating him. Then and there, after searching his house once more, they determined to put him in a rowboat and to ship him to the Illinois side of the Mississippi river. However, their plan couldn't be carried out the same day. Logs were

coming down the river from the north, and no one was brave enough to get into a boat and row him over to the other side. All were incensed at Stephan! They wouldn't even allow him to live in his house. He had to live in a tent nearby. The next day, May 31, at 10:30 a. m. Stephan, stooped over a cane, and protesting his innocence with visible emotion, was conducted to a waiting ferry. He was rowed across the Mississippi river by two men. Equipped with a spade and axe, he was placed on the Illinois side near a curious rock formation which bore the lurid name of "The Devil's Bake Oven."

Why was C. F. W. Walther chosen for this mission? Had he shown any qualities of leadership to this date? Was he particularly active in the matters of the colony? Was he experienced by age or otherwise? He was the youngest of all the clergymen, being 27 years old. He had not been active in the affairs of the colony. In fact, he was one of the least important of the clerical group. The answers to the questions are purely conjectural. He was probably chosen because no one else wanted to go. We know that God had His hand in the whole matter. C. F. W. Walther was slowly but surely ripening into leadership.

The fall of Stephan signaled the beginning of difficult and turbulent times for the Saxons. The troubles, the anxieties, which beset them were endless. I shall not discuss the deep needs of food and shelter, nor do I wish to mention the great amount of sickness, fever, and disease which harrassed the colony; remember, they were out in the wilderness under God's heaven.

But the worst development was the rise of two opposing groups, a clerical faction and a lay faction. The clerical faction seemed dominant, but the lay faction was strong enough to create doubts in the hearts of the colonists. The truth of the matter was that the lay faction was largely in the right and the clerical faction was tenaciously clinging to its hierarchical system of government. They were trying to play Hamlet without Hamlet. Stephan was dead as far as the colony was concerned. But they tried to keep the old regime going. All were agreed that Stephan had disgraced himself, but they said his ideas of church and civil government were correct. The thing to do was to carry on as before.

The laymen, however, tried their level best to discredit the clerical group. What were the principles on which the lay party wished to see the government of the church based? In their formal protest *(Protestationschrift)* we find statements like these: "All Christians are priests through baptism by faith and must exercise the priestly office, not only as a matter of right but as a matter of command." "As spiritual priests, laymen have the right to judge all doctrine and to supervise all the activities of the clergy." "The final decision of all disputes rests with the local congregation. The local congregation has the power and the duty to establish all rules regarding liturgy, ceremonies, and church constitution." "The true church is invisible." "It is dangerous to judge people as to doctrine and as to their faithfulness over against established teachers. Equally dangerous is the habit of extolling clergymen as a class because such a habit engenders servility and hypocrisy." "The best type of church polity is the one that prevailed during the first two centuries of the Christian era. All that time individual congregations, some small and some large, existed independently side by side." "The assosciation of individual congregations is not necessary and may be harmful. The concept of the *ecclesia representativa,* i.e., that the church is represented in the clergy leads to papacy and to a lack of interest in church matters on the part of the laity." "Men who have not studied, yes, ordinary men, may administer the sacraments. Stephan taught false doctrine concerning the church, concerning church polity, concerning secular government, concerning the office of the ministry, concerning excommunication, and concerning the cure of souls."

The lay party, as these principles taken from the *Protestationschrift* show, stood for an extreme congregationalism, with heavy emphasis on the individual. Like the Anabaptists, they took certain isolated quotations from Luther's writings of the early 1520's, tore them out of context, and tried to construct a new church polity. Had the lay party prevailed during these two years of intense struggle, the church polity of the Missouri Synod would have been a highly individualistic congregationalism, somewhat akin to the polity of the Southern Baptist Convention. The fact that both the lay party and the clerical party were authoritarians, that both went to Luther's writings for their ammunition, made an intensely difficult situation.

At times the lay party went to almost ludicrous lengths—with the aid of quotations from Luther—in their efforts to subordinate the clergy to the laity. With candor they advocated a subordinate position for the clergy; for instance, in public processions the clergy was to follow the laity to demonstrate the honored position of the laity.

Ferdinand Sproede, one of the leading laymen of the colony, who had been a particularly ardent Stephanite, a hot-headed and rather pugnacious fellow, a baker by occupation, wrote a document in which he "gave the preachers a terrific shellacking and condemned their call and office." His argument was that the colonists were no congregation and that therefore Walther had no call. The congregation which Walther served in Perry County and from which he was called to Trinity Church, St. Louis, could not give him a release because, said Sproede, "They were no congregation, and therefore the call which he claimed to have from them was no call at all."

Though C. F. W. Walther opposed a public confession of guilt on the part of the emigrating company, he does not seem to have tried to keep individuals from making such statements; there was a regular epidemic of confessing during 1840-1841. His brother made one. His brother-in-law, Pastor E. G. W. Keyl, made a lengthy one. Pastor C. H. Loeber also made a rather long confession, which he called "Renunciation of Stephanism." Pastor Ernst Moritz Buerger tells us that he made three sincere and lengthy confessions in three different meetings. Candidate Theodore Brohm felt the urge to write a confession. This was followed by a document of Magister Wege, in which he is said to have been guilty of gross exaggeration. Every clergyman was confessing, except C. F. W. Walther.

Why didn't Walther want to confess? Why didn't he want to join his fellow pastors in making a clean breast in a common confession? Didn't he have anything to confess? First, he did not believe in a common confession, because a common confession would have to say that they were all guilty. It would distort the facts. He knew that many men had joined the colony more or less innocently. Why, he asked, should the innocent man be put in the same category with a man who was Stephan's secretary?

Furthermore, many of the people who wrote confessions confessed things which were not sinful in themselves. Walther was

particularly opposed to making certain acts sinful which were not sinful. He called it *"Sündenmacherei."* The whole concept of Law and Gospel came into play. Walther by this time was foreshadowing his future stand on the Law and Gospel.

When all is said and done we have to remember the status of Walther at that particular moment. Walther had been an extremely zealous Stephanite in Saxony. His rabid Stephanism had gotten him into endless trouble with both the civil and ecclesiastical authorities in Saxony. He had repeated rows with his teacher at Brauensdorf. He had a tiff with the school officials because he stubbornly refused to introduce certain new textbooks. Furthermore, he had broken up several homes by insisting that the wife, "a real Christian" (Stephanite), would have to leave her husband and "follow Christ to America." Furthermore, C. F. W. Walther had been guilty of "kidnapping" his niece and nephew, Theodore and Marie Schubert. The warrants for his arrest arrived one day late at Bremerhaven when the colony left Germany. He had hurriedly left, getting permission to sail on the first boat, the *Johann Georg*.

In addition to this, Walther's release from his former parish was not entirely clean. While he received a formal release from the consistory, his obstreperous behavior as a Stephanite prevented him from securing an entirely clean release. The confessions implied that the emigration was sinful and that they would have to return to their homeland. The possibility of a return to Germany was rather distasteful to the young pastor. Consequently, C. F. W. Walther refused to join the parade of confessors.

Finally, a public debate on the questions which had all but disrupted the colony was set for April 15 and 20, 1841, at Altenburg, Perry County, Missouri. To what extent Walther promoted the rising clamor for a full and free public debate of all the issues involved in the lay-clerical controversy cannot be ascertained with any degree of certainty from the documents at hand; but we do know that he had been sweating over the problems of the colony for more than two years.

This public debate is a definite milestone in that it marks a turning point in the development of church polity in the colony. At all events, from that time on the colonists knew where they were headed. Whether it was really the "Easter Day" of the bedeviled

colony, as one of the participants, the exuberant Schieferdecker, later called it, may be questioned. This much is certain: it helped to clarify the people's thinking. It catapulted C. F. W. Walther into a position of prominent churchmanship.

Who were the debaters? Walther, of course, was the chief leader on the clerical side. Franz Marbach, a lawyer, was beyond a doubt the most able of the lay leaders. Marbach was concerned with the moral aspects of the problem in his discussions. He had drawn a number of counter theses with which he hoped to destroy the propositions which Walther had set forth. He attacked the problem *negatively*. His first question was, "What is a false church?" He offers a threefold definition in answer. A false church is every church which is not the true orthodox church; it is every church which has been adulterated, but which has not entirely lost the foundation of the true church which is Jesus Christ; and finally, Marbach said, "A false church in the most eminent sense is a group of people who have not been called by means of the true Word to the true Christ, but by means of the false word to a false Christ." This latter definition of a false church is the one which Marbach applies to their colony. The conclusions which he draws from his various definitions of a false church show how completely he is caught in the idea that their problem is a moral one. To apply the word "church" to an organization that is built upon something that looks like the Word of God, but is not, is not a misuse of the term, he maintains, but it is simply unscriptural. God never calls such people a "church," or His children. Since such people have a false word, a false spirit, and a false Christ in their hearts, they cannot be saved. There is no salvation in such a church. Such churches, Marbach claims, have no God-given authority to administer the mysteries of God which have been entrusted to the Church and until they have repented and renounced the false word and false Christ and returned to the true Christ, they cannot call a pastor or administer the Sacraments. Until such time they are only a godless mob, and such a mob is not merely to be reformed, but to be built anew from the ground up. Until it destroys the old foundation, it is under the wrath of God; and he who wishes to save his soul must avoid contact with such a mob.

We see from this that the heart of the discussion was the nature of the church. What, then, is the Church? "A seven year

old," says Martin Luther, "knows what the Church is. Namely, the holy believers and lambs who hear the voice of their Shepherd. For the children pray thus: 'I believe in one holy Christian Church.' "

Walther was violently opposed to those who saw only a moral issue in their problem, and who made the intensity of their own contrition a yardstick with which to measure the sincerity of other people's confessions. He calls such men "conscience pounders" *(Gewissensdränger).* He spoke of the tyranny of the conscience. *(Gewissensbeherrscherei),* of making things to be sin which are not sin *(die neue Pest der Sündenmacherei),* of calling into question the grace of God, which many of us believe we have received.

Walther asks why should men who were the confidants of Stephan and initiated into all the secrets of Stephan, who knew what was going on—why should they make the amount of their guilt and the intensity of their confessions the yardstick with which to measure the amount of guilt to be assessed against the simple, uninitiated layman? Many followed Stephan, Walther claims, who had neither the ability nor the opportunity to judge. They did it in their ignorance. They were not wicked; they were misled. Would it be fair to hold them equally responsible with the intimates of Stephan? Besides, what good could come from a collective public confession? Walther would have nothing to do with such nefarious dealings.

Walther took his cue from Dr. Edward Vehse, a lawyer who returned to Germany, although he had violently opposed Vehse at the beginning of this two-year period. He now saw that Vehse, aside from his many lapses into error, had many good points which should be exploited. Pushing personalities and morals into the background, Walther took a realistic position. He even thought that their emigration might be a work of God; but whether it was or not, it certainly was not the issue on which to lose time right now. The burning issue was whether they were a part of the Christian Church and whether, as a part of the Christian Church, they had the right to call ministers and whether their ministerial functions were also valid in the sight of God.

It was here that Walther put forth his now famous Altenburg Theses:

I

The true Church, in the most real and most perfect sense, is the totality *(Gesamtheit)* of all true believers, who from the beginning to the end of the world, from among all peoples and tongues, have been called and sanctified by the Holy Spirit through the Word. And since God alone knows these true believers (II Tim. 2:19), the Church is also called invisible. No one belongs to this true Church who is not spiritually united with Christ, for it is the spiritual body of Jesus Christ.

II

The name of the true Church belongs also to all those visible companies of men among whom God's Word is purely taught and the holy sacraments are administered according to the institution of Christ. True, in this Church there are godless men, hypocrites, and heretics, but they are not true members of it, nor do they constitute the Church.

III

The name "Church," and, in a certain sense, the name "true Church," belongs also to those visible companies of men who have united under the confession of a falsified faith and therefore have incurred the guilt of partial departure from the truth; provided they possess so much of God's Word and the Holy Sacraments in purity that children of God may thereby be born. When such companies are called true Churches, it is not the intention to state that they are faithful, but only that they are real Churches as opposed to all worldly organizations *(Gemeinschaften)*.

IV

The name "Church" is not improperly applied to heterodox companies, but according to the manner of speech of the Word of God itself. It is also not immaterial that this high name is allowed to such communions, for out of this follows:

1. That members also of such companies may be saved; for without the Church there is no salvation.

V

2. The outward separation of a heterodox company from an orthodox church is not necessarily a separation from the universal Christian Church, nor a relapse into heathenism and does not yet deprive that company of the name "Church."

VI

3. Even heterodox companies have church power; even among them the goods of the Church may be validly administered, the ministry established, the Sacraments validly administered, and the keys of the kingdom of heaven exercised.

VII

4. Even heterodox companies are not to be dissolved, but reformed.

VIII

The orthodox Church is chiefly to be judged by the common, orthodox, public confession to which its members acknowledge and confess themselves to be pledged.

What did Walther accomplish with his victory at Altenburg? Pastor Loeber who wrote a letter to Superintendent Guericke in Saxony seven days after the close of the debate said: "The doubts of many have vanished. Those who had formerly been convinced were now strengthened in their conviction." The air was clarified.

The conviction grew generally that they were a part of the invisible Christian Church *(una sancta ecclesia)*, that as such they had the power to call ministers, and that ministerial acts of such properly called ministers were valid also in the sight of God. The individual congregations did not hesitate to call pastors, and a healthy church life began to develop.

Just how did the principles which Walther derived from Luther work out in the day-to-day life of a Lutheran congregation? Was the Luther principle that laymen have the power by majority vote to regulate financial and spiritual matters practical? Did the theory of the "Supremacy of the Congregation" work? Did Walther's doctrine of the transfer of the pastoral office to one man of the congregation *(Uebertragungslehre)* work out in practice?

Nowhere is the working of these principles better revealed than in the minutes of Trinity Lutheran Church, St. Louis, one of the mother churches of the Missouri Synod. A careful reading of these minutes will yield a wealth of pastoral knowledge which will be amazing.

In the framing of the constitution for the congregation we see how Walther proceeded step by step according to the principle he had gained in the Altenburg debate. In the instruction for the officers, for example, the congregation laid down the following rules: 1) Any member of the church board *(Kirchenrath)* who ceases to be a blessing to the congregation and becomes an offense may be removed by vote of the congregation at any time. 2) The activity of the church council shall in no wise deprive an individual church member of the rights and privileges guaranteed to him by the priesthood of all believers. 3) Members of the church council must observe the utmost secrecy concerning all private matters that are discussed in the meetings of the council. 4) At every election to church office this "Instruction" shall be read to the voters.

In the meeting of November 8, 1841, the "Instruction" was changed to the effect that the name *"Kirchenrath"* be stricken because it was offensive to some *("weil er einigen anstössig gewesen ist")*. *"Gemeindevorstand"* was substituted. In the meeting of January 24, 1842, it was decided that the four elders were to change off in presiding over the meetings of the voters. In the meeting of February 28, 1842, someone suggested that the congregation follow the constitution of Zion Church in Baltimore in appointing a committee to nominate suitable candidates for the election of elders. This suggestion was flatly rejected, because the voters wished to retain full freedom in electing their elders *("sondern dass die Gemeinde die freieste Wahl behält")*.

Similarly Walther dealt with the problem of building a church, and with the forming of Synod. Everywhere we look we find the same tenets of the church polity being applied; in fact, we see that everywhere Walther works he applies the principles of churchmanship developed at Altenburg and refined in his handling of the embryonic church elsewhere.

Freud, Mowrer, and the Problem of Anxiety

Henry J. Eggold, Jr.

CLERGYMEN and clinical psychologists and psychiatrists are coping with the growing problem of neurotic and psychotic behavior. But in past decades those theologically oriented and those scientificially trained have not been able to attack this problem in a spirit of mutual confidence. More often than not, psychology charges that religion is prescriptive without being diagnostic, while religion charges that psychology is diagnostic without being prescriptive. Today, however, there are signs which indicate a possible reconciliation between religion and psychology.

> Many feel that there is a healthy *rapprochement* beginning between two groups which for years not only had been separated by lack of mutual interest and communication but have in some instances shown suspicious, resentful, disdainful, or actively hostile attitudes to each other.[1]

Forsaking the Freudian approach, a new school of psychologists, led by men like Erich Fromm, O. Hobart Mowrer, Moreno, Sullivan, Stekel, and others, has arisen which espouses a view of the cause and cure of anxiety which promises at least a partial reconciliation between psychology and religion. It is the intent of this paper to examine this new view to point out its positive as well as its negative features.

As a point of departure, and by way of contrast, it will serve our purpose to examine briefly the Freudian approach, which since the end of the nineteenth century has dominated the field of psychoanalytic technique. To understand both Freud and Mowrer it is necessary to clarify the concepts of the id, the ego, and the superego. Heidbreder defines the id as

> . . . the deepest and most primitive part of the personality. It is profound, obscure, unconscious, and powerful . . . the id, though powerful, is quite without perception; it is unmoral, unenlightened, imperious, and rash. Seeking only the pleasures of the moment, it demands its satisfactions insistently and blindly.[2]

The id is often called the sum total of the instinctual drives. The superego is the sum total of all of the laws established by God or man, parents, society, or even the self-imposed laws of the individual. It is the artificial self we feel we ought to be because of the introjection of the parental vetoes, as Freud called it, plus the inherited conventions of society.[3] The ego is really the will of the individual. It endeavors to manipulate the environment and to regulate the id with reference to it. The ego seems to correspond quite closely to the will of the individual.

Freud maintained that conflict is produced when the blind but insistent demands of the id are vetoed by the demands of the superego, which acts like a policeman in its relationship with the id. Because Freud found that sexual difficulties lay behind the neuroses of a high percentage of his patients, sexual experience was for Freud the clue to neurosis.[4] When a person finds that the superego will not permit the id to carry out its drives, the ego supresses the id and consciously denies the existence of the repressed instinctual drives.

R. S. Woodworth regards the two theories of repression and infantile sexuality as the twin pillars on which the Freudian hypothesis rests. He says:

> If we put the two theories together, we have in a nutshell the fundamentals of Freud's psychology . . . the importance of repression, the importance of sex desire and the importance of the infantile period are Freud's three main emphases . . . a neurosis originates in repressed infantile sexuality—that is his main proposition.[5]

Now, when because of fear of the oppressive superego, these libidinal drives are repressed, they avenge themselves by mental symptoms of anxiety, or fear, or physical symptoms.[6] The anxiety becomes disassociated with the original fear and becomes a free-floating general condition of the patient.[7]

Since the cause of the anxiety remains out of reach of the conscious mind of the patient, Freud turned to the search of the unconscious mind in an effort to bring it to consciousness. His method was that of free association and interpretation of dreams.

> Freud's method aims at recovering to consciousness the repressed material in the unconscious mind. In that vast

> depth are stored, he teaches, all the memories of the past, right back to the hour of birth, and perhaps before that. When these memories have reached consciousness, been re-lived again so as to express their emotional content, the patient can the better adjust himself to life, for his inner-emotional abscess has discharged its poison—to use a psychological figure—and he can guard against recurrence because he sees the factors that formed it in the first place.[8]

The goal of the psychoanalytic treatment is to have the patient develop insight into the causes of his anxiety, to remove his fears by showing him how absurd the demands of the superego are, and to provide release for the instinctual drives.

Today Freud's approach to the problem of anxiety is being seriously criticized. His basic supposition that anxiety results from the suppression of instinctual drives is seriously questioned.[9] Experience demonstrates that some who practice continence are emotional stable, while, at times, libertines are filled with anxiety. But more seriously, Freud is charged with promulgating a doctrine of social irresponsibility which has penetrated deeply into our culture. In a recent book Richard LaPiere, a sociologist, declares that the Freudian ethic has penetrated deeply into our culture and is characterized by individual passivity and irresponsibility, reflected in the permissive home, progressive school, and other agencies, and adopted in the new middle class, modern guildism, political maternalism, and the security goal. He declares that while the Freudian ethic abounds in such terms as guilt feelings, personal insecurity, frustration, aggressive tendencies, traumas, there is a total absence of such terms, " . . . prominent in the protestant ethic, as self-confidence, personal integrity, self-reliance, responsibility."[10]

Finally, Freud is to be condemned for his antipathy to the values of Christianity. To him religion is nothing less than the universal obsessional neurosis of humanity. In his book, *The Future of an Illusion,* he says:

> Thus religion would be the universal obsessional neurosis of humanity. It, like the child's, originated in the Oedipus complex, the relation to the father. According to this conception one might prophesy that the abandoning of religion must take place with the fateful inexorability of a process of growth, and that we are just now in the middle of this phase of development.[11]

> You have to defend the religious illusion with all your might; if it were discredited—and to be sure it is sufficiently menaced—then your world would collapse, there would be nothing left for you but to despair of everything, of culture, and of the future of mankind. From this bondage I am, we are, free. Since we are prepared to renounce a good part of our infantile wishes, we can bear it if some of our expectations prove to be illusions.[12]

O. Hobart Mowrer's approach to the cause and cure of anxiety is, in many respects, the very antithesis of the Freudian view. His major premise is that man is a responsible subject. He points out that man is able to weigh the future against the immediate consequences of his action. This gives man flexibility and freedom and, by inference, responsibility. In this sense man differs from the animal. Addressing the convention of the American Psychological Association in Cincinnati recently, Dr. Mowrer declared: "The idea that man can have the benefits of an orderly social life without paying for it through restraints and sacrifices is a subversive doctrine."[13] Rollo May correctly concludes that for Mowrer ". . . the problem of neurotic anxiety is placed squarely in its cultural and historical nexus, and is related specifically to man's distinctive problems of social responsibility and ethics."[14]

Neurotic symptoms develop not as a result of too little self-indulgence and satisfaction or from the suppression of the demands of the id, but from irresponsibility, from ignoring or suppressing the demands of the superego. Anxiety arises from the repudiation of moral feelings, from a lack of ego strength. To put it quite simply, neurotic symptoms arise from sin. Using the analogy of the child-parent relationship Mowrer explains his position thus:

> So long as a child is good, his parents are benign and loving and the child is comfortable; but when the child is bad, the parents become punitive and the child knows no rest. Only when the child once more takes it upon himself to do as he is supposed to do can he hope to find peace, freedom, an amity in his relations with the parents. Translating this early interpersonal trauma into the intrapsychic events of later life, ego and superego (as the legatee of parental authority) are harmonious only when the ego obeys or, perhaps more accurately, anticipates (honors) the demands of superego. When there is an ego failure, superego takes matters "into its own hands," in a manner analogous to the way parents "take over"

> when the child, as they say, fails them; an amity is re-established only when ego (or child) again accepts the responsibilities that are regarded as its proper portion.[15]

To Mowrer the return to the doctrine of sin is imperative. He declares, ". . . we have disavowed the connection between man and his misconduct and psychopathology; we have also very largely abandoned belief in right and wrong, virtue and sin."[16] Stekel agrees with Mowrer.

> On the basis of his rich clinical experience, Stekel also formed the opinion that in the precipitation of the typical compulsive syndrome the breakdown of the parental moral authority plays the central role, and that the compulsion—neurotic structure centers around traumatic secrets connected with this "complex of shattered authority." Memories related to the traumatic events are never really forgotten but annulled, pushed aside, as it were by the neurotic affects and preoccupations.[17]

Mowrer continues by showing that a man cannot sin with impunity. Sin, as he conceives it, is a break with sincerity; it is an abrogation of human intimacy, integrity, honesty, and faith.[18] It is the estrangement of the individual from those whom Sullivan calls "the significant others."[19] And sin breeds a sense of guilt. Guilt, in turn, breeds fear, fear of detection and fear of punishment.

Both psychologists and pastors agree that the sense of guilt plays a large part in neurotic behavior. It is at the bottom of many anxiety states. Weatherhead distinguishes three kinds of guilt: 1) Normal guilt—the sense of sin which follows wrong doing; 2) Exaggerated conscious guilt—the intolerable burden which follows some incident, the guilt of which has been exaggerated out of all proportion; and 3) Repressed guilt—"The feelings of guilt which have been repressed into the unconscious because they are so objectionable to the consciousness."[20]

Schizophrenic patients are victims of this repressed guilt. Harried by fear of detection and punishment, they lapse into mutism, bizarre behavior, and self-rehearsed stratagems. A graduate student of psychology, himself a schizophrenic, has defined the schizoid personality thus:

> . . . he is a terrified, conscience-stricken crook, who has repressed his interest in people, unavowedly insincere

> and uncooperative, struggling against unconscious sexual perversion. He is of no mean Thespian ability. And his favorite commandment is that which one nowadays facetiously calls the eleventh commandment, "Thou shalt not get caught."[21]

If the cause of anxiety is guilt produced by the loss of moral integrity, the cure lies in helping the individual to develop a sense of community, openness and relationship.[22] To put the matter another way, if anxiety has resulted from ego weakness, the cure lies in developing ego strength within the individual so that he will comport himself in a manner acceptable to the demands of the superego. Alexander says, "The ego's integrative function is the basis of the regenerative process in the field of personality disorders."[23] The supportive therapy is not to be aimed at freeing the individual from a supposedly unrealistic and traumatical superego, as Freud taught. It rather endeavors to help the individual to do the things he realistically should do and not do the things he realistically should not do.[24]

In this program of strengthening the ego, the counselor plays a more significant role than Freud would allow. Mowrer and his school emphasize that the contact between the anxiety victim and the counselor should be a mutual and collaborative one. Cholden says, "Our ability and interest in empathizing hold significant meaning for the patient. Ferenczi is quoted as having said, 'It's not so bad being crazy, if someone goes along who knows the way back.' "[25] In a similar vein Whitehorn declares:

> Our observations, already reported in some detail, led us to state that in the psychotherapy of schizophrenic patients, improvement seems to be determined, in large measure, . . . by the differences found among physicians in the extent to which they are able to approach their patients' problems in a personal way, gain a trusted, confidential relationship and participate in an active personal way in the patients' reorientation to personal relationships. Techniques of passive permissiveness or efforts to develop insight by interpretation appear to have much less psychotherapeutic value.[26]

The function of the counselor is indeed to attempt to help the anxious soul find insight into the cause of his anxiety. But Mowrer, unlike Freud, says that the development of insight is not sufficient.

The individual must learn to act as a responsible subject in society. In attempting to provide the anxious soul with the necessary ego strength, Mowrer advocates a number of methods. The first of these is self-therapy. Moreno declares that this method is essentially a self-cure through self-realization and integration into life. He indicates that convincing historical illustrations of this method are to be found among famous personages like Jesus, Buddha, St. Francis.[27] Another form of self-help is bibliotherapy. Mowrer avers that a careful study of what ordinary people find helpful in reading might be highly suggestive as to what it is that the frankly sick person is seeking.[28] Building on the principle that people do not get well in analysis, but in life, Mowrer also favors group therapy.

> Group psychotherapy has received recognition because it satisfies certain needs which the individual therapies cannot satisfy. We live from birth on in groups. Disturbances which are conditioned in a large measure by the world around us cannot be resolved unless the milieu is made a part of the therapeutic situation and treated simultaneously. Group psychotherapy approximates more closely the natural setting in which people live. This does not mean that individual methods of therapy have not their usefulness, but group psychotherapy includes them and opens up a new vista. The individual is not treated in isolation, but *in situ,* in the context in which he is found: in the family, in the workshop, in the community, or in clinics as members of synthetic groups.[29]

The validity of group therapy is substantiated by the fact that in World Wars I and II and in the Korean conflict the treatment of combat casualties in or near the combat zone proved to be more effective than the results with patients evacuated to the rear.[30] This experience seems to underscore the value of the therapeutic community for the anxious soul. Here Mowrer sees the value of the congregation as a therapeutic agent.

Another article in Mowrer's creed is that "It is easier to act yourself into a new way of thinking than to think yourself into a new way of acting."[31] "A person gets well of emotional difficulties not just by being treated by others, but by himself being a 'helping person.' "[32] Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous support the truth that one helps himself by helping others. Jordan Scher reports an experiment in which patients in a mental hospital were required to perform certain tasks and in which obedience was

insisted upon. "The results of this experiment in responsibility were significant. The patients put out a newspaper, a number of them became well enough to return to normal society. Assaultedness progressively decreased. The patients took up interest in their appearance."[33]

Moreno summarizes the advance that has been made in treating the anxious in the following manner:

> From the patient on the couch, to the patieint in the chair, to the patient on his feet, and, finally to the patient able to act-out and integrate his initial and external relationships *in vivo,* a considerable part of the psychotherapeutic movement since the beginning of the century can be charted. On the other hand, from the analyst as a black screen, to the middle-of-the-road, more active psychotherapist (Adler, Stekel), to the openly participating and integrating psychodramatist, a long way has been trodden.[34]

How shall we assess the position of Mowrer with respect to the cause and cure of anxiety? Certainly we can see a number of elements with which we agree. Mowrer himself feels that there is a close connection between his view and that of religion. Concluding his study he says:

> If our present analysis is valid, religion is perhaps the most powerful device ever discovered for making the unconscious conscious, in the sense of replacing compulsion (sin, neurosis) with choice (integration, volition, self-direction).[35]

Certainly we can agree with Mowrer on the following points: That man is a responsible creature, that sin is the cause of anxiety, that sin breeds guilt, that a counselor should be a cooperative, helping other, that living altruistically is to be preferred to living selfishly, and that there is value in viewing the church as a helping community.

But Mowrer is to be criticized because he fails to make room for God in his explanation both of the cause and of the cure of anxiety. From the Christian point of view this failure is fatal.

> Health is the complete and successful functioning of every part of the human being, in harmonious relationship with every other part and with his relevent environment . . . and for Christians the name of that environment is the God whom Christ revealed.[36]

In his excellent book, *Counseling and Theology,* Hulme argues that man cannot be separated from his relationship with God. He declares:

> Since the sting of guilt is in the separation it produces between an individual and his God, the adequacy of any non-religious solution to this problem is doubtful. It would fail to meet the deeper level of anxiety that grows out of the break between man and his Creator, which can never be basically dispersed at the upper levels of human relationships.[37]

This exclusion of God in Mowrer's thinking is a serious fault because it discredits the fact that man lives under the judgment of God because of sin. To say that sin is only social insincerity is to fail to realize the deeper consequences of sin in terms of man's estrangement from God. Furthermore, conversion is infinitely more than making a truce with one's fellowmen. It is fundamentally getting right with God, by turning from self-will and self-rule to a life in Christ under the will of God. Again, in Mowrer's view there is no room for the concept of forgiveness in the Scriptural sense. No man can find peace for his guilt except he find peace with God through Christ. Otherwise he remains without God and without hope in this world and in the world to come. For these reasons we must conclude that though Mowrer approaches some of the basic concepts of the Christian message, his view is still far from the Kingdom.

However, a study of his position does alert the pastor and preacher to his task. If it is true that there is wide-spread anxiety in the world, then we ought to view the sermon as a medium for mass counseling and preach sermons that are therapeutic in character. This is not to say that we are not to preach doctrine, but it does underscore the thought that we ought not to preach doctrine for doctrine's sake, but always preach it in lively rapport with human need.

In the second place, Mowrer's view reminds us that the staple of our preaching ought to be law and gospel, sin and grace. In fact, I once heard Mowrer charge modernistic pulpits with monstrous truancy for neglecting the preaching of these basic scriptural truths.

In preaching the law we ought to emphasize the fact that man is a responsible subject before God. His very creatureliness makes him accountable to God. Furthermore, sin ought to be preached for what it has always been, rebellion against the just demands of God. Again, sin ought to be preached in terms of its consequences. Sin brings guilt upon the individual and the just punishment of a holy God.

But in rapport with the preaching of the law must be the gospel of the infinite grace of God who commended his love toward us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us. No guilt-ridden soul can find rest until in repentance he turns from sin in genuine sorrow and accepts by faith the love of God in Christ. Only in the knowledge that he is not under the law but under grace can the guilty soul find rest.

> The doctrine of justification satisfies the need of the individual for acceptance (forgiveness); and for acceptance as he is (by grace); and in acceptance he may claim as his own (through faith). No pastor who has witnessed the power of this doctrine in leading another Luther out of his prison house of guilt into the free air of redemptive grace can ever doubt that it is fundamental not only to a system of theology but also to pastoral counseling.[38]

Nor should the preacher underestimate the power of the Word of God both in his preaching and pastoral care. It is the power of God because through it the Holy Spirit accomplishes his work of convicting the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment, of re-creating the guilty soul as a child of God at peace with God. This regenerating power of the Holy Spirit gives the individual the ego strength he needs. Once the sinner realizes the mercy of God for him in Christ, the Spirit of God continues to work in him to will and to do God's will.

Of significance, too, is Mowrer's emphasis on the congregation as a helping community. The pastor ought to view his congregation not simply as a collection of individuals but rather as the body of Christ, in which the strong bear the infirmities of the weak, in which they share their faith with one another, strengthening one another in the Christian way. Certainly our Bible classes and congregational organizations can do much to make the congregation

the sort of helping community it can be. Furthermore, the congregation offers every individual the opportunity for the necessary and healthful program of service to Christ and his church.

Finally, every pastor ought to remember that the person of the counselor is more important than his method. Each of us has reason to pray daily for the gift of the Holy Spirit that we may deal with people with some of the loving concern of Jesus for those that labor and are heavy laden.

NOTES

1. Paul E. Meehl, *et. al., What, Then, is Man?* (St. Louis, 1958), p. 1.
2. Edna Heidbreder, *Seven Psychologies* (New York, 1933), p. 398.
3. Leslie Weatherhead, *Psychology, Religion, and Healing,* (New York, 1952), pp. 263f.
4. *Ibid.*
5. R. S. Woodworth, *Contemporary Schools of Psychology* (Ronald Press, 1931), quoted in Leslie Weatherhead, *op. cit.,* pp. 275f.
6. Weatherhead, *op. cit.,* p. 252.
7. Rollo May, *The Meaning of Anxiety* (New York, 1950), p. 116. Later Freud reversed himself by saying that the repression does not create the anxiety; anxiety is there first; then comes repression. Cfr. Sigmund Freud, *New Introductory Lectures in Psychoanalysis* (New York, 1933), p. 119.
8. Weatherhead, *op. cit.,* p. 262.
9. *Cfr.* Wayne Oates, *Anxiety in Christian Experience* (Philadelphia, 1955), who lists other causes for anxiety: Economic anxiety, Finitude anxiety, Anxiety of grief, Legalistic anxiety.
10. Richard La Piere, *The Freudian Ethic* (New York, 1959), pp. 63f.
11. Sigmund Freud, *The Future of an Illusion,* p. 76 quoted in O. H. Mowrer, *Psychoanalysis and Religion: A Partial Reconciliation* (Champaign, 1957), p. 7.
12. *Ibid.,* p. 95.
13. "Sin and Psychology," *Time,* LXXIV, 69.
14. May, *op. cit.,* p. 116.
15. O. Hobart Mowrer, *Psychoanalysis and Religion: A Partial Reconciliation,* p. 28.
16. "Sin and Phychology," *op. cit.,* p. 69.

17. *Progress in Psychotherapy,* F. Fromm-Reichman and J. L. Moreno, eds. (New York, 1956), p. 137 quoted in O. H. Mowrer, *New Perspectives in Psychotherapy* (Champaign, 1957), pp. 78f.
18. Mowrer, *New Perspectives in Psychotherapy,* p. 9. Mowrer's views parallel those of Soren Kierkegaard. Cf. Kierkegaard's *Sickness Unto Death* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948) and *The Concept of Dread* (Princeton; Princeton University Press, 1946).
19. *Ibid.,* p. 7.
20. Weatherhead, *op. cit.,* p. 341.
21. Tom Wilson, *A New Theory of Schizophrenia* (Champaign, 1957), p. 40. To safeguard his identity, Dr. Mowrer has used a pen name for the writer of this article.
22. Mowrer, *New Perspectives in Psychotherapy,* p. 12.
23. *Ibid.,* p. 56.
24. Mowrer, *Psychoanalysis and Religion: A Partial Reconciliation,* pp. 23f.
25. Mowrer, *New Perspectives in Psychotherapy,* p. 25.
26. F. Fromm-Reichman, *op. cit.,* pp. 64-65.
27. *Ibid.,* p. 24.
28. Mowrer, *New Perspectives in Psychotherapy,* p. 62.
29. F. Fromm-Reichman, *op. cit.,* p. 64.
30. *Ibid.,* pp. 186-187.
31. Mowrer, *New Perspectives in Psychotherapy,* p. 22.
32. *Ibid.,* p. 88.
33. E. Pumpian-Mindlin, "Changing Concepts of Therapy in a Veterans Administration Mental Hygiene Clinic," *The American Journal of Psychiatry* (1957), CXIII, 1095-1098.
34. F. Fromm-Reichman, *op. cit.,* p. 326.
35. Mowrer, *Psychoanalysis and Religion: A Partial Reconciliation,* p. 33.
36. Weatherhead, *op. cit.,* pp. 311. 315.
37. William E. Hulme, *Counseling and Theology* (Philadelphia, 1956), pp. 109f.

More Power for Lutheran Pulpits

Rudolph F. Norden

Pastor Rudolph Norden, editorial assistant of Synod's Commission on College and University Work, Chicago, handles a weighty subject with the lighter touch.

THE Lutheran minister is mindful of the high privilege accorded him to be a spokesman of Jesus Christ. His vocation is unilateral, according to the Savior's reminder, "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain." As the ministerial office is a gift of Christ to those holding it, so is the minister himself a divine gift to the Christian community. St. Paul tells the Ephesiains: "*He gave* some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers." The minister himself and those ministered to are thus instructed to regard this spiritual office with due honor and respect.

While the position of the man of God has enjoyed recognition intramurally, there were times when individuals outside the church viewed it with jaundiced eye. There were critics of the clergy, sometimes not without cause, long before Communists released waves of anti-clericalism. One cannot say that Lord Macauley was unsympathetic to the Christian ministry as such when he satirized a deficient young parson in these terms, "While he explains what seems most clear, So clearly that it seems perplexed." In another poem the same author takes a rather pompous country clergyman to task in this genteel criticism, "Dr. Humdrum, whose eloquence flows, Like droppings of sweet poppy syrup."

A past era found the exponents of Biblical Christianity, perhaps because of unwarranted dogmatism, not particularly welcome among the intelligentsia of our land. Anti-clerical sentiments, as witness "Red" Lewis' *Elmer Gantry,* coincided with the rise of science liberated from metaphysics and a pragmatist philosophy detached from theology. However, Henry C. Link, a psychologist, and others in his generation led the return to religion, while in England C. S. Lewis was a bellwether among scholars re-discovering Christian theology. All this took place before "fox-hole religion" emerged from the immediate perils of World War II. The return

to religion preceded Norman Vincent Peale, Bishop Sheen, Billy Graham, and other popular preachers. Without taking anything away from any of them, it is probably true to say that they did not so much create the religious wave as that they are riding it.

The net result is that the theologian, from parish pastor to seminary professor, enjoys a measure of respectability among people of thought. He represents the queen of the disciplines, now recognized again as self-containing. Dr. Edgar Carlson, president of Gustavus Adolphus College, bears witness to this when he writes: "There was a time when the theologian lived off the crumbs from the table of the psychologist, the philosopher, and the sociologist. But developments in Biblical theology have been so decisive that theology is recognized as having a definite field of its own."

The Theologian in the Pulpit: The Text

The pastor rises to his full stature as a Christian theologian in that high moment when he enters his pulpit. This is his shining hour, his golden opportunity to proclaim the *kerygma* of Christ crucified for sinners. Not only does he reach what is most likely the largest assembly of the week; he reaches it in an atmosphere of worship and prayerful attention. This is an opportunity not to be muffed.

Church custom and tradition suggest that he begin with a text. The text is not chosen on the spur of the moment. It has been selected long before Sunday morning, to be prayed over, studied, evaluated, and readied for homiletical use. How far in advance of the Sunday service, under normal conditions, should the sermonizer begin with his survey of the text? Under the pressure of multitudinous parish duties sermon preparation is sometimes deferred until Friday. There is then not sufficient time to do justice to the creative task of developing the God-given resources of the text. With time running out, the temptation is great to rely heavily on someone else's printed sermon, or to fall back on trite phrases, theological cliches, and spiritual bromides. Matter-of-fact reiterations of theological formulae do not hold the attention—and the attendance—of people who have become discriminate as to the content of public presentations. Neither does, what Walter Lippmann calls, "the deep slumber of a decided opinion." The Christian preacher who

addresses people of thought faces the task of serving the new wine of the Gospel in new bottles. Stated in another way, his function is to confront his generation with evangelical Christianity in modern thought-forms and language. Thus hearers of many backgrounds and experiences will come to appreciate what one educated layman recently described as "the genuine relevance of vital and valid Christianity to the present situation."

An effective way of beating week-end deadlines for the Sunday sermon was once described by Dr. Louis B. Buchheimer, who was for many years in the pulpit of Redeemer Lutheran Church, St. Louis. Far from improvising from Sunday to Sunday, this skillful homiletician selected his texts and themes in advance for the coming church year. For each Sunday's sermon he set up a file. From time to time, as he came across illustrations, quotations, textual insights, parallel passages, and truths germane to these texts, he inserted this material into the respective file. This sermonizer began his preparation for any given sermon as much as a year ahead of its actual delivery. In other words, a great deal of mining preceded the final minting. This is keeping the homiletical larder well stocked, with the result that "the barrel of meal shall not waste, neither shall the cruse of oil fail."

Some pastors prefer to preach on the propers—the standard Epistles and Gospels, or on texts in various pericopal systems. Others gravitate toward free texts. Much can be said in favor of preaching on the pericopes, provided the treatment remains fresh and is supplemented from other portions of Holy Scripture. A routine use of the pericopes results in a pericopated, apocopated, incomplete Bible. The Christian minister, on the other hand, is committed to declare the whole counsel of God.

Free texts, if for a season the pastor elects to sermonize on them, should be chosen with care and with the purpose in mind of preaching sinners into heaven through faith in Jesus Christ. Free texts give the preacher greater leeway in adapting his message to given occasions and to situations and problems calling for Christian thought. In the end, it makes little difference what system or combinations of systems is used, if the distinctive meaning of each text is set forth and the expounded Word slanted to the needs, problems, and interests of worshippers.

Choosing Thought-Provoking Themes

The reading of a meaningful and majestic text, of course, should be followed by a theme worthy of the dynamic spirit and life of the Word of God in the text. Sometimes themes announced on bulletin boards or from pulpits fall below the challenge of the text. It is obvious that God is at work in the latter, and man in the former. The incongruity between a red-blooded text, yea, one that flows with the life-giving blood of Jesus Christ, and an anemic theme is too much of an off-set. It is a letdown, somewhat reminiscent, as one has said in another context, "of the Boston Philharmonic Orchestra tuning up for ten minutes and then playing 'Pepsi-Cola Hits the Spot.' "

State your theme in stimulating, challenging, attention-arresting, and thought-provoking terms, so that even he who came to sleep will become wide awake. This is not to say that cheap and shallow sensationalism should be resorted to, for that is something else again. Interest in the sermon can be aroused by stating the theme in question form, particularly in such question form as not to suggest a cut-and-dried answer. A theme like "What Do I Mean To God?" is effective because the hearer does not at once know the set answers but awaits them from the speaker.

Other sermonizers create interest in the theme by offering a contrast, as does Templeton in "Pebbles or Pearls?" and another in "Streetlamps or Stars?" A pastor speaking on the text: "We wrestle not against flesh and blood . . . " might well effect a contrast by wording his theme: "Fencing or Fighting?" Sometimes a current phrase or expression can be given a twist to make it relevant to a spiritual problem. The current phrase, "Design for Living", under the deft hand of a recent sermonizer became, "Design for Christian Living." Attention should be given to how a theme looks in print, or how it strikes the ear. An example of good phrasing is, "Peter, Reed and Rock."

Introduction, Door to Sermon Theme

The introduction is not to be a little sermonette by itself. Its function is to effect a proper lead-in to the theme. This purpose may be accomplished by referring to a recent event, which then becomes an analogy. For example, a pastor preaching on Christ's

parable of the merchant seeking pearls and finding the Pearl of Great Price, might begin this way: "In 1947 a Bedouin goatherd in the rugged terrain about the Dead Sea set out to look for a lost goat. Instead he discovered somethinig of far greater value in a cave—the Dead Sea scrolls."

Striking quotations are also appropriate for sermon introductions. If you intended to say something about the Sputnik Age, which has some Russian scientists claiming that they found no evidence of the presence of God in space, you can point out that this is not a new claim. The astronomer Le Lande said long ago, "I have searched the heavens and found no God." You can balance it off with a companion quotation from Kepler, the Christian astronomer who was thinking his thoughts after God, or Abraham Lincoln's words as inscribed on a marker in the Springfield, Illinois, cemetery where the great emancipator lies buried: "I cannot conceive how a man could look up into the heaven and say there is no God."

The Sermon Itself

As for the structure of the sermon, Louis Henri Sullivan's dictum on architecture applies: "Form follows function." What is the function of the sermon? Is it not to confront modern man, burdened with his own and the world's sins, with the Good News of salvation in Jesus Christ? A scholarly dissertation that fails in its function to attract twentieth century people to the foot of the first century Cross is a lost presentation, despite profundity and precise form. By the same token, a sermon sparkling with witticisms that divert rather than direct to Christ represents love's labor lost, despite its light-hearted informality.

The "old line, rose-water modernist," who by-passed Sin and the Atonement is an anachronism. Sin and Salvation must still be preached with capital S's. There can be no appreciation of the Gospel unless the Law first determines man's personal guilt and desperate circumstances when left to his own devices. Bo Giertz, Sweden's Bishop of Gothenburg, is not only in tune with present-day trends in theology but also expresses what was always the genius of prophetic and apostolic preaching when he underscores the reality of sin in these trenchant terms: "Our whole generation, which has

stood up to its neck in the putrid sewers of sin and nearly drowned itself in the consequences of ugly godlessness, ought really to have learned that sin is not an empty word." To pass over sin in favor of more engaging, but less relevant, subjects, would in the poet Auden's word, be "talking of navigation while the ship is going down."

Of course, the knowledge of sin and its consequences is not enough to make anyone a Christian. Law preaching minus the Gospel may by another route lead hearers to the same abyss of despair and sense of futility to which Eugene O'Neill's play *Long Day's Journey Into Night* leads its auditors. Despair of God's mercy, whether by legalistic, Gospel-less preaching or atheistic existentialism, is six of one and half-dozen of the other. The "empty throne of God," the "irrelevance of God," the condition described by Martin Buber as the "eclipse of God," and by Pascal as the "misery of man without God" represent the desperate philosophy of many people in our times. To offer answers to man's questions, the Christian minister leads his hearers from the knowledge of sin to the comfort of forgiveness and perfected salvation in Jesus Christ. In every sermon the way of salvation should be clearly underscored. No one who has ever sat under a Christian pulpit should be able to say on the day of final judgment, "I went to church one time but was not told of Christ, the Savior."

Whatever the structure of the sermon, its foundation is always what W. E. Gladstone was pleased to call the "impregnable rock of Holy Scripture." Preaching should mean opening the Scripture. The failure to speak God's Word encourages Biblical illiteracy and deprives the pulpit of its unique power. He who speaks for God cannot be uncertain as to the authority of his message, lest the trumpet give forth an uncertain sound and none will gather for the battle.

Linguistic Dress of the Sermon

If the purpose of Christian preaching is to communicate God's revealed truths, not only the sermon structure but also its language garb will prove ancillary to it. The choice of words is important. A good sermon answers to Robert Frost's characterization of good poetry, namely in it "understanding comes to the surface and you

catch it without fishing for it." Abstract art with its symbolism is meaningful only to the initiated. Sermonic art cannot afford to leave people out in "left field." On a given Sunday morning the pastor addresses himself also to unindoctrinated and uninitiated hearers. Therefore, it is necessary to communicate through understandable language. Theological and philosophical jargon, also argot that offends and hides meaning, should be avoided.

Effective preaching includes also the courtesy which Dean Acheson, in quite another connection, called "hospitality to intelligence." Most of our hearers these days have at least a high school education, and we can pre-suppose understanding on their part. What St. Paul had to say about Christ-less wisdom in First Corinthians Chapter 1 and other places should not be wrenched out of context and made to apply to helpful science, pursuit of truth, and "to all pure arts and useful knowledge." The Lutheran Church, born in a university, is not hostile to higher education, nor does it believe that the quest of knowledge is the alternative to faith. Anti-intellectualism in our circles, if any, stems from later developments.

How can language be enriched? A seminary professor, who had occasion to read many sermon manuscripts, once expressed the opinion that ministers should read more poetry to enhance their speech. There are certainly people in the Sunday assembly who can appreciate good poetry, not only from the English classics (Shakespeare) but also from meaningful modern poetry. In fact, some of the most pertinent confessions of Christianity are in our times voiced by our poets. By way of example, it will do something for a festival sermon on the Nativity of Christ to cite Ted Hughes' line in "Hawk in the Rain", telling us that Christ's was a childbirth that "righted the stagger of the world."

The choice of words comes easier when the pastor lives in close rapport with his parishioners. Aware of their concerns, cares, needs, interests, and sympathies, he can address himself more knowingly to them. Humor has it that a pastor once preached an eloquent and incisive sermon against dancing in a veterans' hospital. The trouble was, however, that he was preaching to a congregation of amputees.

A realistic painter of the English social scene of some two centuries ago was Hogarth. In a well-known picture he depicts a poor

sinner enroute to the gallows at Tyburn Tree. Hogarth supplies him with two spiritual counselors, one a "stuffed shirt"-type clergyman riding in his coach and the other a plain parson sufficiently concerned about the spiritual welfare of the man as to ride with him in the cart. It is not the pastor who rides in the isolated splendor of a coach but the one sharing his parishioners' cart who speaks intimately and intelligently to his flock.

Accentuate the Positive

The pastor prefers to cast his pulpit message in positive terms. Negative, controversial, defensive, and apologetic preaching gives people wrong impressions of the straight-forward Gospel proclaimed in Lutheranism. Fosdick, if his words may be quoted in this context, is worth hearing: "We defend religion too much. Vital religion, like good music, needs no defense but rendition. A wrangling controversy in support of religion is precisely as if the members of an orchestra should beat folks over the heads with their violins to prove that music is beautiful. Play it." The exposition of the Lutheran catechism is exemplary in this respect: It presents the truths of Christianity positively.

The Delivery

Through good delivery the content of the sermon is communicated to the hearer. Speaking styles vary with individuals, inasmuch as talents are diverse in this respect. A good style for all to cultivate is natural speech in "enlarged conversation." The tone of voice is that of conversation, only the volume is "turned up" to make the voice audible to all in the sanctuary. Public address systems, with which many of our larger churches are equipped, favor use of the natural speaking voice. No shouting is necessary.

As for pulpit manners, one extreme to be avoided is the limp informality which may be proper for a lounge discussion but not for the pulpit, which has a tradition of dignity and power to uphold. "There are some preachers who preach like after dinner speakers," writes Dr. George Forell of the Chicago Lutheran Seminary in an overt criticism of too informal a preaching style. On the other hand, stiff formality is likewise to be eschewed, as Dr. C. F. W. Walther urged in one of his asides in *Proper Distinction*

Between Law and Gospel: "I do not want you to stand in your pulpits like lifeless statues." As for demeanor and facial expression, the Christian minister has every reason to radiate the joy of the Christian religion. Let him not be a counterpart to one of Cervantes' figures—"The Knight of the Woeful Countenance."

Sustained Performance

Effective and fruitful preaching is not a one-time, one-shot performance but a sustained effort. Edward Hicks made his reputation as a painter on only one picture, namely "The Peaceable Kingdom," which shows lambs and lions lying down together and William Penn with tranquilized Indians in the background. Clement Clarke Moore became famous because of one poem, "A Visit From St. Nicholas," although he also wrote a two-volume compendium lexicon of the Hebrew language which no one remembers. A pastor, on the other hand, cannot make his reputation on the strength of one good sermon. His purpose should be to achieve and maintain a high caliber of preaching from Sunday to Sunday; also on occasions when attendances are slim.

There is no need for special gimmicks, tricks, or techniques borrowed from motivational research. To paraphrase Vance Packard, we also have a Hidden Persuader, namely the Holy Spirit. "I will pray the Father, and He will give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you forever, even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him, but ye know Him, for He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." John 14:16-17.

> "For He can plead for me with sighings
> That are unspeakable to lips like mine;
> He bids me pray with earnest cryings,
> Bears witness with my soul that I am Thine,
> Joint heirs with Christ, and thus may dare to say:
> O heav'nly Father, hear me when I pray."

Called Teachers' Retirement: A Faculty Opinion

The following resolution was sent to the Faculty with a request for an opinion. Apparently some of the brethren in the Association had their misgivings regarding the enforced retirement provision in the resolution.

A RESOLUTION REGARDING CALLED TEACHERS
BE IT RESOLVED:

1. (A) Called Teachers' retirement age shall be 65, or sooner, if he shall so elect. The retirement shall become effective at the end of the school term during which he shall have attained the age of 65.
   (B) By mutual agreement between the School Board and said retired teacher, he may be rehired on a contract basis.
   (C) Said teacher's salary, by mutual agreement by said teacher and the Board of _____ Lutheran School Association, shall be not less than the salary said teacher received before changing his status.
2. That said called teacher's status, after reaching the retirement age and/or sixty-five years of age, shall be that of a contract teacher.
3. That Contract Teachers shall be on a year-to-year basis of hire, the contract being between teachers or instructors and the _____ Lutheran School Association.
4. That teachers' or instructors' contract can be terminated, governed by the rules of the constitution of the_____ Lutheran School Association, directed by the School Board of the Association.
5. That this resolution be presented at the next _____ Lutheran School Association meeting; and if the resolution be adopted, that the first four points be made a policy of the _____ Lutheran School Association, _____ _____, and of said School Board, and incorporated into the by-laws of the Constitution of the _____ Lutheran School Association, _____ _____.

The Faculty Opinion follows:

1. The teaching ministry in the church is ordinarily a lifetime profession for the individual. Thus, a servant of the Word expects and is expected to serve the church or the local congregation(s) to which he has been called during the normal course of his working life. He may, however, accept another call. Likewise, he can be dismissed for the usual reasons, such as persistent teaching of false doctrine, scandalous life, and refusal or inability to carry out his duties.
2. Under normal conditions the Call, which is a relationship established by God between the church and the servant, is limited only by circumstances affecting the ability of the servant or the needs of the calling agency.
3. A proper call must always determine the *area* of activity and may also determine the *length* of service required. (The best interests of the individual and of the calling agency may at times require a limitation of tenure. The divinity of the call is not affected by such limited tenure.)
4. It would appear that Paragraphs 1 (B) and (C) in the proposed resolution are designed to assure a servant of the Word that, if he is able and willing to serve, he will be given that opportunity.
5. While there is no conflict between the proposed resolution and the doctrine of the call, the matter of Christian ethics must be considered in the implementation of any such resolution. Care must be taken not to violate the sanctity of the call. Christian brotherly love dictates that the congregation(s) also fulfill its obligation to its servants. Thus, provision will be made for the decent maintenance of the servants, not only while they are actively engaged in their work, but also in their retirement. Pension plans, provision for housing, etc., need to be considered.

Respectfully submitted,
Martin Naumann
Otto Stahlke
Martin Luebke

Adopted by the Faculty, April 14, 1961

Book Reviews

WELTKIRCHEN LEXIKON, *Handbuch der Oekumene im Auftrag des Deutschen Evangelischen Kirchentages. Herausgegeben von* Franklin H. Littell *und* Hans Hermann Walz. Kreuz Verlag, Stuttgart, 1960. 1762 columns. Cloth.

This *Handbuch* is a most valuable one-volumn encyclopedia of the Ecumenical Movement. Very recent information is made available concerning the leaders, the Churches, and the events related to this movement. The title page states that the lexicon was prepared under the consultation of Georges Florovsky, Walter Freytag (deceased), Adolf Keller, Hendrik Kraemer, Kenneth Scott Latourette, Bishop Stephen Neill, Reinhold Niebur, and Kristen Ejner Skydsgaard. The non-Christian religions are included.

The world-wide aims of the Ecumenical Movement are propounded with fervor, as becomes a "manual"; at the same time the disagreements between the various writers are evident. Any research in ecumenical developments is greatly facilitated by this *Lexikon,* but for information concerning non-member Churches the reader must look elsewhere. The Lutheran Free Churches are found under *Altlutheraner* in association with the Missouri and Wisconsin Synods. *Christliche Dogmatik* "von F. Pieper und T. Mueller, hg. von der Ev.-Luth. Synode von Missouri, 1946" is found among the Literature under the article *Schöpfung und Erhaltung.* "The Survival of the historic Vestments in the Lutheran Church after 1555," 1958 by A. C. Piepkorn is found under *Kleidung, geistliche.*

Otto F. Stahlke

THE GREAT PROPHETS. By Ruhi M. Afnan. Philosophical Library, New York, 1960. 457 pages. Cloth. $5.00.

A Mohammedan writes about revealed religion and its great prophets, Abraham, Moses, Zoroaster, Jesus, and Mohammed. The principal thesis is that God provided a prophet and a suitable revelation at various times of great moral decadence. These repeated revelations constitute a "Perennial Religion". The book is of interest in the study of foreign affairs and world religions. Afnan pays his respects also to Bahaism as a religion for our day, but as yet unproved.

Otto F. Stahlke

EUTYCHUS (and his pin). Edited, with an apology, by Edmund P. Clowney. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, 1960. 102 pages. Cloth. $2.50.

The writer of the "Eutychus" letters in *Christianity Today* is revealed. Clowney's "gifts in the lighter vein can be traced back to the days in which he edited a campus weekly, *The Wheaton Record.*" His second book, *Preaching and Biblical Theology,* is due next year, representing his professional work at Westminster Seminary, Philadelphia.

Otto F. Stahlke

THE LUTHERAN WORLD. Publication of the Lutheran World Federation. National Lutheran Council. Volume 3, Number 4 (March, 1961), 50 Madison Avenue, New York, New York.

The Symbols are sometimes referred to as the forgotten documents of American Lutheranism. While the historic Confessions of Lutheranism have not been "forgotten," they have not received the attention which they deserve in seminary classrooms, pastoral conferences, in the teaching program of Christian congregations, and in private study.

It is heartening to observe that the Lutheran World Federation devotes the March issue of its journal to a discussion of the Confessions. Dr. Stig Hanson, pastor in Göteborg, writes on "The Confessions—Bridge Between Yesterday and Tomorrow." George A. Lindbeck, professor of history at Yale, presents a particularly interesting historical analysis of the role of "Confessions as Ideology and Witness in the History of Lutheranism." Robert H. Fischer of Maywood in his contribution, "The Confessions in Our Congregational Life," proclaims the decisive role which the Confessions can play in building up the life in Christian congregations. Thorleif Boman, an Oslo pastor, writing under the heading, "The Confessions in Our Preaching," emphasizes the relevancy of the Confessions for our day.

A few quotations may illustrate the worth and nature of the articles:

> "For Luther, authority did not rest in the confessions themselves. They were rather a short summary of the Scriptures. If we look upon them so, then the confessions, as they appear in the worship service, become a bridge between that which has been and that which shall be on the last day. Because Christ is the same yesterday, today, and forever, the confessions are safeguards to the unity of the Christian faith, and they stand guard by important questions of salvation, in the past as well as keeping alive the promise of a new world, the resurrection and everlasting life." (P. 381)

> "The confessions today are a guarantee that the church today is not diminished or less than that which it was yesterday. There is still sap in the tree, which nourishes the tree and enables it to live on. This is the backbone of the body, which supports it. The confessions are bulwarks against heresy and false doctrine today as they were yesterday when the church was tempted to fall away and to follow another Lord.

> "But the confessions must also hold the Christian hope alive, and help us not to sink our roots too deeply into this world so that we are at home here. Thanks to the confessions the eternal hope and longing for eternity is kept alive. Thanks to the confessions, we don't live in a no-man's land or an empty room; even if we can be called border men, we have nevertheless ties both with yesterday's men of God and prophets, and with the great white host. We need not jealously wish that we could have lived in the time of the apostles, for what they received, we also receive through the Word,

Holy Baptism, and the Eucharist. Let us be vigilant in respect to our confessions." (P. 387)

"But it must also be admitted, I think, that pietist Confessional loyalty is in a sense unnatural and therefore, even where it exists, seriously inadequate. The unnaturalness is shown by the strong tendency of pietism to dissolve into a doctrinal void or into sectarian divisiveness. This seems always to happen when it, as in America, is detached from traditional theological loyalties. Then we have phenomena such as that of American Methodism in which, after a few generations, the evangelical fervor of John Wesley was largely replaced by quite explicit moralistic humanism colored with religious sentiment. At the other extreme, pietism helped produce the highly emotional but empty revivalism of so much American Protestantism, especially in the South. The decline in theological content in these groups is truly astonishing. Jonathan Edwards, leader of the first great revival in the 1740's, was a truly impressive thinker. In America—and especially at Yale where he was educated—he has what I would consider the deserved reputation of being the greatest Calvinist theologian between Cocceius and Karl Barth. His most famous revivalist successor in the early nineteenth century, Charles G. Finney, while vastly inferior, still had enough theological competence to write a dogmatics which displays considerable logical skill. Dwight L. Moody, the next great hero of the movement, was himself no theologian but he had respect for the theological traditions of the Church. However, by the time one reaches the twentieth century, the revivalist leaders are usually theological illiterates like Billy Sunday, and so it is no wonder that they are being in part replaced by the piously tinctured psychology of the "peace of mind" school of Norman Vincent Peale. Billy Graham, the most famous of contemporary revivalists, is generally considered theologically more "respectable." In a way I suppose he is, but at the same time the "decisions for Christ" which his preaching elicits seem often to involve remarkably little definite Christian belief. There is much less theological content in them than in the "conversions" of the nineteenth century revivals. And, of course, when one considers Pentecostal and similar offshoots of revivalism, the Christian content sometimes seems to disappear entirely." (P. 390)

"Confessional exclusiveness has gone hand in hand with divisiveness. A good many, though not all, of the divisions in American Lutheranism are the result of disputes over what constitutes Confessional loyalty. It would be a mistake to suggest that these have never been important, for sometimes they have touched the very center of the faith. This is true, it seems to me, of the controversy over predestination and synergism at the end of the last century. Hundreds of articles and pamphlets were devoted to it and so, in the absence of a proper historical study, I can only hazard the opinion that in this particular case the Missouri theologians were essentially right; the opposition, despite its disclaimers, often did

have leanings towards synergism. But the stricter Confessionalists debated the issue in such archaic scholastic terms, in so legalistic a manner and with so imperialistic an intellectualism that they alienated many who, if they had understood, might have agreed with them. In short, here was a case in which the faith of the Confessions was distorted because it was defended in the out-dated language of the Confessions themselves, and of Confessional orthodoxy. This is even more obvious in the case of Missouri's insistence against the Iowa Synod that one must affirm what the Smalcald Articles say about the Pope as the Antichrist. Once again, I must confess to a certain sympathy with the leaders of Missouri, for this was part of their campaign against a powerful Bibliolatrous fundamentalist chiliasm which has done great damage to American Protestantism and had slightly infiltrated the Iowa Synod. But surely the way in which to fight Bibliolatry is not by "Symbolilatry." We must rather center all our confidence in God's redeeming Word in Jesus Christ, instead of absolutizing either those primary witnesses to the Word which are the Scriptures, or the secondary witnesses which are the creeds of the Church, indispensable as both of these may be." (P. 397)

"But we cannot congratulate ourselves on the fact that Confessionalism has helped to preserve a certain Christian substance. The question is whether it will continue to do so now that Lutherans are entering the mainstream of American life. Lutheranism in my country is facing what seems to me a genuine crisis, even though it is little recognized. When Confessionalism is maintained in traditional terms, it tends to alienate the masses, as it did in Europe. For Lutherans in America the results were not so disastrous because, as we have repeatedly mentioned, Confessionalism provided a support for the insecurities of the immigrants; it functioned in part as a popular ideology and not simply as a witness to the faith. The Presbyterians and the Episcopalians who, in different ways, also tried to maintain traditions, did not have this advantage and so suffered much more heavily than did the Lutherans. It was only the non-confessional free churches who were effectively able to deal with the majority. They adapted themselves quickly and effectively to the new social forms and psychological needs of a frontier people. They made the gospel relevant, and so formed the religious life of the nation. It is largely because of them that America is at present far and away the most church-going major nation in the West, and that there is widespread, even if highly inadequate, religious sentiment. The increasing temptation on the part of American Lutheranism in practice, even if not in theory, is to imitate the free churches, and to try to maintain itself by relaxing its Confessional emphasis, to make this something which is relevant only to the theologians and the pastors, and to leave the people undisturbed in the kind of generalized religiosity which they are absorbing from their environment. There is evidence that the stricter bodies, such

as the Missouri Synod, are just as likely to succumb to this temptation as are the others, for the present danger comes, not from opposition to orthodox-sounding language as long as this remains vague and abstract, but from resistance to the explication in intelligible contemporary terms of what the Christian faith means for the beliefs and actions of individuals and societies." (P. 398-399)

"It would be a mistake to suppose that this task of maintaining the Confessions while overcoming the defensive rigidities of the past is simply one for the professional theologian. Scientific theology as such does not innovate, does not receive the fresh word from God which is appropriate to our times. That word is a gift of the Spirit which is perhaps more likely to come to laymen and pastors than it is to professors. Scientific theology is simply a tool given the Church, helping it to test the spirits to determine whether they are in fact from God. It is because of this testing function that recent theological developments are important, for through them the teaching office of the church now has the possibility of being more open to the prophet and the reformer. It has better means of discerning whether they are in fact faithful to the Bible and the creeds. Similarly the creative pioneers can afford to listen and learn from an institutional church which is able both to accept what is true and reject what is false. This is perhaps not yet a reality, but we may hope that it may become one." (P. 401)

"When the church is attacked and driven into a corner, its preaching takes the form of a confession. Here, however, we have a hint of the limited significance of confessional statements: for the Church dare not wait until it is attacked by the world. It must take the offensive itself. In fact, because the Gospel is not of the world, the positive proclamation of the Good News is often regarded by the world as a disruptive element, and sometimes even as an attack upon the world. With this we must come to terms. In this world the church is involved in an eternal struggle. It is and must be the *ecclesia militans*." (P. 413)

"Luther dissolved the relationship between the church and the secular life, but he did retain and stress man's relationship to God and his commandments. The Protestant churches, and especially the Lutherans, have, however, neglected the opportunity to teach and proclaim the divine worth and the obligations of the secular orders, with the result that the Protestant countries in Europe were secularized and the very un-Lutheran idea of the moral integrity of economics and politics arose and was tolerated by the church. National Socialism has taught us where this doctrine leads to and to what use it can be put. In the Nazi era the church learned that it is possible for the state to strangle it in secular fields by continually restricting its area of operation until it is finally left with God, the soul and the life hereafter. In time the church rebelled against this and in so doing discovered the main item of the Lutheran as of all

Christian confessions: Jesus Christ is my Lord, and, to be sure, Lord over my whole life." (P. 417)

Buy this issue of the Lutheran World. Even better, for $2.50 per year, become a regular subscriber.

G. J. B.

MODERN THINKERS SERIES. David H. Freeman, editor. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan. 1960. Pamphlets, $1.50 each.

The Modern Thinkers Series is part of a projected International Library of Philosophy and Theology. It is sponsored by the Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Baker Book House. The editor, David H. Freeman, is a member of the philosophy department, University of Rhode Island. Several monographs have appeared to date, and others are projected. Creative thinking and originality of approach rather than comprehensive scholarship are the criteria for inclusion in the Modern Thinkers Series. Individual pamphlets published to date average about fifty pages in length, and are written by men highly competent in the field of philosophy. Some of the pamphlets appeared originally in the Dutch language.

KIERKEGAARD. By Zuidema, translated by David H. Freeman.

In this monograph Kierkegaard is seen as a man whose central question is how to be a Christian. In this connection Kierkegaard develops a view of divine revelation, and an idea of the divine—human encounter, in which man encounters God in Christ and is compelled to make an existential decision for or against Him. Zuidema finds in the encounter between God and man the central theme of Kierkegaard's thought and writing. Writing from the standpoint of Reformed faith, Zuidema is quite critical of Kierkegaard's theology. He states on page 10, "It is our intention to show that Kierkegaard in many points had to pervert Biblical revelation concerning Christ in order to make it compatible with his idea of the Absolute Paradox. Kierkegaard distorted Biblical revelation to fit his own preconceived theory of human existence, a theory developed independently of revelation." Zuidema is definitely critical of the viewpoint often expressed that Kierkegaard's existentialistic dialetic is not in conflict with the authoritative teaching of the Church. He says on this point, "It is true that Kierkegaard takes as a starting point the dogma of orthodox Lutheranism. But this dogma is not safe from Kierkegaard's attack. . . . Kierkegaard maintains or employs a criterion by which he judges the teachings of the Christian Church and of the Holy Scripture. He criticizes the Bible and the doctrine of the Church by means of this criterion. This criterion is his existential dialetic. He does not hesitate to employ this standard. Therefore, he modifies the doctrine of original sin so that it is compatible with his extreme individualism. His adherence to this doctrine is purely verbal; in reality it is denied. The Biblical revelation concerning original

sin is discarded in deference to Kierkegaard's existentialistic principle. Nothing remains of the Biblical teaching that the entire human race is included in Adam and fell with him. Adam's first sin was 'Adam's sin' and nothing more. As such it has no consequence for his posterity. They are not born into sin because of Adam's guilt. Each individual repents for himself, in his own existential freedom, the sin to which Adam fell. And he does so independently of Adam. Original sin is not really original sin. Original guilt is no longer original guilt." With respect to Kierkegaard's view of the Bible, Zuidema says on page 40, "Kierkegaard's view of the Bible is also determined by his anti-historicism. The authority of the Scriptures is undermined by him; the utility and scope of Holy Scripture is as a rule called into question, if not directly opposed. And the content of Scripture is reduced by him to the self-witness of Christ with respect to His divine Sonship. It is thus reduced according to Kierkegaard to the mystery of God's becoming, which is the mystery of His person and of His suffering and dying in the redemptive significance. This is all that he needs to take from Scripture. The historical redemptive relationships in which the Bible or the Scripture places Christ and His redemptive work were severed by Kierkegaard. Only the Absolute Paradox remains, the paradox of Christ in His self-witness as this is interpreted and mythologized by Kierkegaard. This is all that remains of Kierkegaard's orientation to Lutheran orthodoxy."

Nietzsche. By VanRiessen, translated by Dirk Jellema.

In contract to Kierkegaard, who was much concerned about being a Christian, Nietsche was consciously and determinedly anti-Christian. Son of a pastor, and intending in his youth to become himself a minister, he turned from theology to philosophy. A sensitive, highly intelligent person, Nietsche was oppressed by the decadence of the latter half of nineteenth century Europe. He found the cause of this decadence in eighteen centuries of Christianity, and felt that Christianity must be destroyed and give way to atheism. Whereas Kierkegaard had attacked the moribund and worldly church of his time and had sought the way back to a vital Christianity, Nietsche attacked Christianity itself. Instead of the humility demanded by Christ, Nietsche glorified the will to power, the super-man, examples of whom he found in Caesarborgia and Napoleon. Nietsche hated democracy and spoke for and predicted the triumph of collectivism. His last ten years were lived in insanity, brightened only by the love and care of his mother and sister. Nietsche must be read in order to understand what is happening to western civilization and why it is happening.

Sarte. By Zuidema, translated by Dirk Jellema.

Jean Paul Sartre is considered one of the present day existentialists. Sartre is an atheist. He purports to be an absolute individualist. Zuidema says on page 12, "Sartre's philosophy of freedom abstracts man from all social relationships and bonds; and he thus has to face the problem of explaining why social bonds and relationships do in fact exist despite the 'fact' that

every man in principle isolates himself as the unique absolute and the absolute unique, in his own hermetically sealed realm of freedom, and imperialistic realm of freedom." Zuidema quotes with approval the remark of Gabriel Marcel, a philosopher of a very different persuasion than Sartre's, "Sartre's individualistic idea of freedom is an attempt to find a justification for a fundamentally irreligious unavailability, or refusal to serve; Sartre's free man may never make himself available for service to a fellowman, or to the community, or to God. But he does have the duty and the call to practice auto-eroticism: to love himself above all, to love himself alone, to love himself as freedom and the might and power of freedom." Zuidema's judgment of Sartre and of his philosophy may be summed up in the statement on page 53, "Sartre's existentialism is anti-theistic, and anti-Christian humanism. He blames the philosophers of the Enlightenment for not having destroyed Christianity root and branch. Alas, they kept many remnants of Christianity, for they continued to believe as good rationalists in an objective order of values which are independent of man and thus limit man's freedom and place man under authority. The Enlightenment did not realize that man is the existential-creative source of all values and law. These remnants, says Sartre, must be demolished in the name of existentialism and thus in the name of humanity. . . . Sartre sees himself as the apologist for true humanism, and as such he can be nothing else than the enemy of every belief in God."

NIEBUHR. By Wurth, translated by David H. Freeman.

Reinhold Niebuhr, contemporary theologian and philosopher, is pictured as having come out of, and stripped off to some extent, the liberalism of the nineteenth and early twentieth century. He saw through the failures of the optimistic proponents of the social gospel. He saw clearly that to a great extent the pronouncements of the social gospelers in a few famous pulpits in America made little impression on the evils that afflicted American society. Niebuhr became a student though not a follower of Karl Marx. Nebuhr became aware of the spiritual and religious danger of Marxism. Moreover, he saw that Russia interpreted the facts from a national perspective, and that far from being a true friend of the masses, she was actually practicing the art of tyranny. In contrast to Niesche and Sartre, Niebuhr maintains the highest regard for Christian morality. Wurth describes Niebuhr's view in the following words on page 23, "In the intimate relationships of life the path of love is the only right course. But every attempt to apply a morality of pure unselfish love to group relationships is bound to result in failure and such a course of action is often irresponsible. Religious pacifists who protest against conscription by their governments in the name of their individual conscience must never be allowed to cripple the will to power of a state."

Interested primarily in ethics and ethical problems, Niebuhr nevertheless developed a theology which for want of a better term must be characterized as a form of neo-orthodoxy. Particularly his doctrine of sin has aroused widespread interest. In contrast to those philosophers who deny the reality of sin, Niebuhr teaches it. He takes the Genesis account of creation and of the fall as myth. He considers it philosophically but not historically true.

Human sin, according to Niebuhr, has its origin in the fact that man refuses to recognize his own nature. Like Adam and Eve in paradise he pretends to be more than he is. His essence is his free will. Sin is the wrong use of his freedom. This is not precisely the Biblical doctrine of sin. Wurth remarks, "We see here again the dire consequence for theology if one exchanges the historical character of divine relation, in respect to what the Scriptures inform us concerning creation and the fall, for philosophical speculation in the spirit of existentialism."

VAN TIL. By R. J. Rushdoony.

In contrast to all the preceding modern thinkers stands Cornelius Van Til, who is himself an orthodox Calvinist, an American disciple of the great Dutch theologian and philosopher, Abraham Kuyper. The Calvinistic orthodoxy of Van Til may be judged from the fact that he is a member of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. Van Til compares the modern philosophers of the type described in the previous pamphlets with the emperor in the fable, for whom his flatterers and sycophants had woven an imaginary garment so fine that only the wise and pure in heart could see it. The result was of course that when the emperor went out in this wondrous garment an honest child remarked, "The emperor has no clothes." Similarly holds Van Til, the philosophers have nothing to parade but their own nakedness. Van Til has flayed both modernism and neo-orthodoxy, and has outraged not a few people by his negative evaluation of the theology even of Karl Barth and Emil Brunner. Against the tendency of philosophers to make man the ultimate, a fault not escaped wholly even by the neo-orthodox, who have attempted to bring God back to a position of honor in philosophy, Van Til holds the system of John Calvin to be the only correct answer to the problems of philosophy. In this connection he erroneously accuses Luther of that synergism, which was introduced into Lutheran theology by Melanchthon, and has been condemned for four centuries by all consistent followers of Martin Luther. Apart from these strictures it is like a breath of fresh air to read the views of Van Til after the irreverent and at times irrational views of men like Nietsche and Sartre.

In general, the series of Modern Thinkers can be whole-heartedly recommended as a reasonably quick orientation in modern philosophical thought.

Fred Kramer

BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY. By G. Ernst Wright. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1960. 198 pages. Paper. $1.65.

This book is an abridged edition of the author's definitive *Biblical Archaeology,* published simultaneously in Great Britain and in America in 1957. This volume was hailed at once as one of the best books dealing with the subject of biblical archaeology and was soon translated into German and Dutch. The price of fifteen dollars has no doubt deterred many a student from acquiring it for his personal library.

The condensation of the larger book was made by the Rev. Roger Tomes of Gomersal Leeds. In the abridgment the material has been slightly rearranged; some touching up has been done to meet the exigencies of a rapidly

developing field of study. The author states in the foreward that a great deal of omission has taken place, although the main points of the original work are all there. The fourteen chapters of the 1957 edition have been reduced to ten. The valuable and helpful bibliographies at the end of each chapter are not in the abridgment.

G. Ernst Wright, Professor of Old Testament in the Harvard Divinity School, an expert in the field of Near Eastern archaeology, shows how during the last hundred years the spade of excavators in Near Eastern lands has done much to deepen the understanding of the literature, civilization and religion of the Judaeo-Christian Bible. The value of archaeology for a better understanding of the Bible cannot be stressed enough. Since the religion of the Bible is connected with a series of events that have occurred in history, it is important for the student of Holy Scriptures to have an acquaintance with the facts of biblical history, a knowledge of which is essential for a proper understanding of the faith set forth in the Bible.

In the reconstruction of biblical history the student finds that there are periods which are not so well known because of the paucity of surviving records. Thus, Wright says: "If the nature of such periods is to be properly understood, and the biblical events fitted into their context in ancient history as a whole, the original background to the biblical material must be recovered with the aid of archaeology." (P. ix).

The author correctly calls attention to the fact that archaeology cannot 'prove the Bible true.' The support that archaeology can give the Scriptures is limited, but it can furnish the historical setting and cultural background, which will aid in the better understanding of the biblical story. In the opinion of Wright it is possible that the findings of archaeology might show that certain biblical events did not occur at all. Concerning this possibility the author writes: "For the most part archaeology has substantiated and illumined the biblical story at so many crucial points that no one can seriously take this position." (P. x)

Wright's interpretation and reconstruction of the history of the Bible is in harmony with that taken by the critical school. The discerning student who accepts the reliability and correctness of the reported facts in the Old Testament will place question marks in the margin of his copy as he reads this very readable account of *Biblical Archaeology*. Thus, Wright does not accept the number of 600,000 men reported in Exodus as leaving Egypt, but believes that the more probable number was between three to five thousand. (P. 42)

The reputation of the author and the reasonableness of the price of the book will undoubtedly secure a host of readers for it.

Raymond F. Surburg

WHAT'S THE ANSWER? By Otto E. Sohn, Concordia Publishing House. St. Louis, 1960. 210 pages. Paper Cover. $1.50.

This book had its beginning in 1954 when the author was asked to give answers to questions submitted by readers of the *Lutheran Witness* on Biblical questions. The book represents a collection of a great number of these

answers, some slightly expanded beyond their original presentation.

Since these questions emanate from the people, reading the questions of the book may enable pastors to understand more fully what their own members are asking and what problems confront them in life and work. Questions like the following no doubt are waiting for answers in almost every parish: Must a person be baptized again when he joins the Lutheran Church? What is the fate of a stillborn child? What of speaking with tongues? What of the claim that unbelievers are annihilated after death? Is there a second chance for those who die as unbelievers? What is meant by the thousand years in Revelation 20? What of the heathen who die without hearing the Gospel? What of life insurance, burial of suicides, church sales, etc.?

The value of the book is enhanced by a rather prolific use of Bible passages, which usually apply to the question, a rather good index, and the arrangement of questions under larger topics.

The questions of the book confirm the reviewer's long held opinion that our people aren't concerned too much about the questions usually discussed by the clergy. Whether Barth and Brunner agree or disagree doesn't disturb them. Their questions come out of their own life experiences and their contacts with fellow workers.

Some pastors could do far worse than using this book as a guide for a series of topics in Bible Class and organizational meetings.

Arthur E. Graf

THE HEALING MINISTRY IN THE CHURCH. By Bernard Martin. John Knox Press, Richmond, Va., 1960. 125 pages. Cloth. $3.00.

The author is a pastor of the Reformed Church in Geneva. This is reflected in what he says about the Sacraments. The value of the book lies primarily in this that he convincingly sets forth that which is frequently forgotten; namely, that God does not want man to be physically sick, but well. Of further value is the chronological list of healings by Christ and His disciples as well as the author's studies on the relationship of sin and prayer to sickness.

He makes the mistake, frequently made by men writing in this area, of condemning all prayers for the sick which add "if it be Thy will" (pp. 76, 83). He recognizes that this position creates a problem since all men must die; nevertheless he leaves the problem unresolved.

In spite of the book's short-comings, reading the book will make you more concerned about your own health and that of your members.

Arthur E. Graf

MODERN SCIENCE IN THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. By John W. Klotz. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1961. Paper. $1.75.

". . . To call attention to the many blessings which God has given through science in the twentieth century, to suggest that the pursuit of truth

through science deserves to be encouraged, and to urge that these gifts which have come through science be used to glorify the God who has given them," expresses Dr. Klotz's purpose in writing this volume.

Already known for his *Genes, Genesis, and Evolution* (1955) and his substantial contribution to *Darwin, Evolution, and Creation* (1959), the theologian-biologist, who is professor at Concordia Senior College, Fort Wayne, Indiana, has again contributed creditably to the subject of a Christian's confrontation with modern science, and he has succeeded to do so in popular, readable style.

The book was obviously not designed as a high-powered scientific treatise on a narrow theme. Instead, it has a general thrust in the direction of concerned interest in science on the part of Mr. Average-Christian. He would do well to read it. Perhaps even a few sophisticates (of which breed, besides the proverbial mule, "Missouri" has a few) would do themselves no harm to be reminded of the basic questions which arise in the conflict between scientific theories and Scripture.

For the statistics-value alone the opening chapters on the physical and biological sciences as they relate to our daily existence are probably worth the price of the book. These chapters make interesting reading but the usual caution on statistics and their use applies, illustrated by the current definition of a "stati'stician" as the man who wades through a stream of the average depth of three feet—and drowns.

Those who need a short refresher on the *modus operandi* of science will find chapter three helpful. With the methods the scientist uses and the factual data he compiles we are generally in no position to find fault. "We can, however, disagree more freely with the conclusions he draws from these facts," Dr. Klotz insists. "They may or may not be correct. This makes for a relativity in science, a relativity that works and that has been very fruitful; nevertheless, a relativity that must be recognized." (p. 69) This conclusion is good and defensible. Science, after all, is no omnipotent and magic-working genie that can supply answers and solve problems in all areas of life, as the scientific humanist claims.

Most significant in the book are chapters four, where Dr. Klotz speaks to the problem of science and the supernatural, and five, where he confronts the ongoing tension between the creationist and evolutionist views on origins. Proceeding on the presupposition that "truth is one whether it is scientific truth or spiritual truth," (p. 79) the author makes a double plea: that Christians recognize the basic honesty of the scientific researcher in probing mysteries of the physical and biological realms; and that scientists return the favor to the Christian theologian who is concerned with understanding and articulating the revelation God has given of Himself and His purposes in Holy Scripture. (p. 84f)

One cannot discount the fact, Dr. Klotz is frank to admit, that "there are some facts which can be interpreted as indicating that evolution has taken place" (p. 94) and that most biologists of standing support some form of evolution. These scientists, with their fossils, strata of earth, flora and fauna in puzzling distribution, etc., all have disturbing questions for the

Christian who accepts the Genesis version of the world's origin. But the problems are not necessarily insuperable, nor are the questions which remain unanswered of such a nature that evolution receives all the support and creation none. The tables are sometimes turned, as Darwin himself recognized. Dr. Klotz states: "The evidences do not *prove* evolution; also other interpretations of the data are possible. . . . It is not unreasonable to believe that the change which has occurred has been limited and has occurred within fixed and closed systems, the 'kinds' of Genesis." (p. 103)

Again, without avoiding the knotty problems raised concerning the age of the earth by scientific "time clocks" (uranium, thorium, potassium, etc., reduced to their respective decay products over a measurable period of time), Dr. Klotz looks at the evidence in what appears to be objective treatment, pointing to some of the loopholes in the conclusions that are drawn, but then feels compelled to rest his case with the view "that the Bible throughout seems to teach a young earth rather than an old earth." (p. 116)

The amazing complexity, balance, and interlacing of nature are described convincingly in a separate chapter. The author devotes one chapter, "Antiscientific Trends and Attitudes," spelling out a plea for attitudes on the part of Christians individually and the Church in general which will, in spite of excesses and exaggerations on the part of science, give continuing and responsible support to all genuine scholarship and research. His concern patently is that the Church least of all should fall prey to anti-intellectualism, once termed by Senator Fulbright "that swinish blight so common in our day."

One might have wished for more thorough theological treatment in the concluding chapter of the "Ethical and Moral Problems Raised by Science," but the author has maintained his apparent goal of a brief and popular treatment. The book includes a good bibliography, as well as topical and Scriptural indexes.

E. F. Klug

BOUGHT WITH A PRICE. By Arthur E. Graf. Faith Publications, 3224 Sherman Street, Springfield, Illinois, 1961. 140 pages. Cloth. $3.00.

This book of sermons came directly into the hands of the reviewer from the author who is a colleague on our seminary faculty. Professor Graf teaches in the Department of Practical Theology. The volume contains two sets of sermons. The first, Occasional Sermons, includes three on Stewardship, one each on Easter, Reformation, Commencement, Marriage, and Use of Alcoholic Beverages, among others. Some of the catchy titles are, "You Reap What You Plant," "The Three R's in Religion," "Highway Markers Along God's Road to Wedded Bliss." The second series is "The Seven Last Words of Jesus."

The author modestly states in the Preface: "The sermons in this book were written and preached while I was in the parish ministry. They contain little of man's wisdom either in form or content. They represent an

attempt to present the profound things of God in a simple manner. . . . Since these sermons were written to be preached, they will read much better when read aloud." This, then, is down-to-earth preaching. The style is straightforward, unadorned rhetoric. The author is not only plain-spoken, but occasionally brutally frank. The homiletical esthete may occasionally wince as he reads, but he will never mistake the meaning of the author.

The sermons on stewardship strongly urge percentage giving or the tithe, but seek to do so in an evangelical spirit. The use of statistics for effect, in at least one instance ("31,535,998 [people] go to hell every year"), may well raise a question. As a rule, however, such devices, together with a liberal use of illustrations and examples from everyday, grassroots living, effectively infuse the presentation with vividness. The many citations from Scripture insure the quality of authority. The purpose of these sermons, the author states, is the same as that of St. John who wrote at the close of his Gospel: "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through His name." This is the cherished goal of every Christian preacher worth his salt. These sermons do exalt the Savior, but at the same time they exemplify the art of plain speaking. Preachers who are impatient with current "la-dee-da" treatment of the Law and with the preaching of the Gospel in "gobbledegook" will find this volume refreshing as well as useful.

Erich H. Heintzen

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Acknowledgment of a book does not preclude a review in subsequent issue.)

AND GOD SAID NO. By Lael Cappaert. Augustana Book Concern, Rock Island, Ill., 1961. Paperback. 143 p. $2.00.

AT THE LORD'S TABLE. By Conrad Bergendoff. Augustana Book Concern, Rock Island, Ill., 1961. Pamphlet. 30 p. 25 cents each, $2.75 doz.

BARTH. By A. D. R. Polman. Modern Thinkers Series. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1960. 68 p. Paperback. $1.50.

BEAUTIFUL HOMEMAKING. By Charlene Johnson. Augustana Press, Rock Island, Ill., 1961. 136 p. Cloth. $2.50.

THE BIBLICAL DOCTRINE OF JUDGMENT. By Leon Morris. Wm. B. Eerdmands Publ. Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., 1960. 72 p. Cloth. $2.00.

DISCIPLINES FOR DEVOTION. By Lloyd L. Burke. The Augustana Press, Rock Island, Ill., 1961. 32 p. Pamphlet. 30 cents.

EDGE OF THE EDGE. By Theodore E. Matson. Friendship Press, New York, N. Y., 1961. 165 p. Cloth. $2.95.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. By Thomas Hewitt. Tynedale Bible Commentaries. New Testament Series. Vol. 15. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., 1960. 217 p. Cloth. $3.00.

HISTORY OF INTERPRETATION. By Frederic W. Farrar. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1961. 553 p. Cloth. $6.95.

INTELLECTUAL FOUNDATION OF FAITH. By Henry N. Wieman. Philosophical Library, Inc., New York, N. Y., 1961. 212 p. Cloth. $3.75.

LIFT UP YOUR LIFE. By Morris Goldstein. Philosophical Library, Inc., New York, N. Y., 1961. 194 p. Cloth. $4.75.

MULTIPURPOSE TOOLS FOR BIBLE STUDY. By Frederick W. Danker. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., 1960. 289 p. Cloth. $3.75.

THE OLD TESTAMENT: ITS ORIGINS AND COMPOSITION. By Curt Kuhl. John Knox Press, Richmond, Va., 1961. 354 p. Cloth. $4.50.

OUR ENGLISH BIBLE: NO GREATER HERITAGE. By Charles Gulston. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., 1960. 233 p. Paperback. $1.95.

PAUL AND HIS RECENT INTERPRETERS. By E. Earle Ellis. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., 1961. 63 p. Paperback. $1.75.

PREACHING AND BIBLICAL THEOLOGY. By Edmund P. Clowney. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., 1961. 124 p. Cloth. $2.50.

SPECIAL REVELATION AND THE WORD OF GOD. By Bernard Ramm. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., 1961. 220 p. Cloth. $4.00.

ALTARS FROM GENESIS. By Robert A. Happel. The Christian Education Press, Philadelphia, Penn., 1961. Paperback. 115 p. $1.50.

BEHOLD, THE LAMB: A Christmas Service for the Church School. By Margaret Fashant. Augustana Book Concern, Rock Island, Ill., 1961. Pamphlet. 16 p. 10 cents.

JOSEPH, THE PRIME MINISTER. By William M. Taylor. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1961. Cloth. 241 p. $2.95.

MOSES, THE LAW-GIVER. By William M. Taylor. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1961. Cloth. 482 p. $2.95.

LIGHT AGAINST DARKNESS. By Bela Vassady. The Christian Education Press, Philadelphia, Penn., 1961. Cloth. 176 p. $3.00.

A MINISTER'S SCRAPBOOK. By Andrew Kosten. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1961. Cloth. 119 p. $2.50.

NO GREATER HERITAGE. By Charles Gulston. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1961. Paperback. 233 p. $1.95.

OUT OF THE EARTH. By E. M. Blaiklock. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1961. Cloth. 92 p. $2.00.

THE PACE OF A HEN. By Josephine Moffett Benton. The Christian Education Press, Philadelphia, Penn., 1961. Cloth. 100 p. $2.50.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN, part two, 11-21, and THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN (Vol. 5, Calvin's New Testament Commentaries, David W. and Thomas F. Torrence, editors), translated by T. H. L. Parker. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1960. 217 p. Cloth. $3.00.